
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



US 532⁷.150

The Catholic question in
politics. 1856

U5 5321.150

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



BOUGHT FROM THE
AMEY RICHMOND SHELDON
FUND

US 5321.150

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



BOUGHT FROM THE
AMEY RICHMOND SHELDON
FUND

be returned to the
the last date stamped

a day is incurred by
specified time.

ply.

THE CATHOLIC QUESTION IN POLITICS:

COMPRISING

A SERIES OF LETTERS

ADDRESSED TO

GEORGE D. PRENTICE, Esq.

(OF THE LOUISVILLE JOURNAL.)

BY

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

**LOUISVILLE, KY.:
WEBB, GILL & LEVERING.
1856.**

U55321.150
✓



Sheldon fund

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1856,

BY WEBB, GILL & LEVERING.

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the District of Kentucky.

~~~~~  
A. F. COX,  
Stereotyper and Printer,  
LOUISVILLE, KY.  
~~~~~

PREFATORY REMARKS

ADDRESSED TO

MY PROTESTANT COUNTRYMEN.

IN compliance with the expressed wishes of many valued personal friends, I here present to the public, in a connected form, the series of Letters to GEORGE D. PRENTICE, Esq., which originally appeared in the columns of the *Louisville Daily Courier*. In doing so, it appears but reasonable that I should introduce them with some explanatory observations, indicating the motives which induced their publication, and proposing for the consideration of my Protestant fellow-citizens, some other matters connected with the subjects therein treated, and not fully commented on in the Letters themselves.

For the first time, since the formation of our government, a party has appeared in the land, which adopts, openly and deliberately, the policy of proscription on account of religious faith. Proscription, in any sense, has no affinity with republicanism. From its very nature, it seeks the advancement of one portion of the people through the degradation of another. But when political proscription is based on the idea that the religious convictions of men are just cause for its exercise against them, those who adopt the principle, are guilty, not only of warring against the very genius of republicanism, but also of usurping the prerogative of the Deity, and

claiming the right to judge and condemn, in the face of the inspired Word of God, which says "judge not," for "vengeance is mine."

From the beginning of the controversy, which necessarily grew out of the recognition of so strange a doctrine in republican party politics by a very considerable minority of the American people, the Catholics have acted entirely on the defensive. They have been attacked, as they conceive, without any shadow of cause, and on a point wherein all men are peculiarly sensitive. Further, these assaults frequently came from quarters, whence Catholics had no right to expect any other than fair and generous treatment. This was particularly the case with reference to the Editor of the *Louisville Journal*. Many of them had been, for years, his warm personal and political friends, and the editor could show no cause for doubting either their honesty or their patriotism. But, even in the hypothesis that he was honest in his conviction of danger to the republic on account of the peculiar religious views of the Roman Catholics, still I hold that the previous good understanding between Mr. PRENTICE and a large number of those holding the faith deemed by him so dangerous, should have induced him to treat them with, at least, some degree of courtesy. But, instead of this, the most rabid sectarian sheet has been mild and gentle, when compared with the *Louisville Journal*. From the position of an open and consistent friend, he jumps, at a single bound, to the attitude of an avowed and implacable enemy, and out-Heroding Herod, he produces a paper, surpassing, in uncharitable invective and naked abusiveness, the vilest of his thoroughly vile Popery-hating cotemporaries. Formerly, a votary of the gentlest of all the muses, he has tuned his pipes to another lay. "*Arma, virumque cano*:"—war is now his theme; and the object of his highest ambition is to break a lance with the "Papal Dragon." I cannot say whether Mr. PRENTICE's valor was whetted, in view of the issue he contemplated, by reflecting on the motives which influenced the old Catholic St. George to undertake the over-

throw of the famous dragon of England, or whether he drew his inspiration from thinking of the mighty deeds of a later anti-Catholic saint of the same country, generally known as *saint* Lord George Gordon. I am inclined to think, however, from certain incidents which lately occurred in Louisville, in which Mr. PRENTICE's friends took some part, and which were somewhat analogous to the doughty doings of Lord George Gordon's forces in London, that the old Catholic St. George is not the editor's *patron* saint. Besides, the "Papist" St. George killed his monster, and skinned him, too, for aught I know, while the monster combated by *saint* George Gordon, like that for which Mr. PRENTICE has been sharpening his spear, turned out, as this one will, a mere fiction of a disordered fancy. There was one element in the character of the old Catholic St. George, through which he was enabled to make clean work of the British Dragon; but this element is wanting in the character of Mr. PRENTICE: he is no *saint* George. It were well, indeed, for the editor to study out the real meaning of this beautiful Christian allegory. Let him first overcome the hydra-headed monsters of fanaticism, and hatred, and uncharitableness, which have their habitation in his own heart, and he may then plead some justification for going about, like another Quixote, hunting after monsters much less repulsive and much less dangerous than those which he may see at any time by casting his eyes inward.

But is Mr. PRENTICE so thoroughly fanatical, as to believe even a moiety of the charges he has brought against the Catholic Church? For myself, I cannot help thinking, that the monster he is combating is a mere figure of pasteboard and buckram, fashioned by himself, and painted in most diabolical colors, which he sets up for the double purpose of frightening Know-Nothing babydom out of its seven wits, and of showing these fear-stricken innocents and simpletons, that they have nothing to apprehend while he is about. Let them but attend to the *supplies*, and he will carry on the war.

For a considerable time, before and after the last August election, it was plainly perceptible, that there existed in the

minds of a large portion of the citizens of Louisville an intense bitterness of feeling against their Catholic neighbors. This hostility, as I thought then, and do still think, was mainly engendered through the agency of the *Louisville Journal*. Mr. PRENTICE has always exerted an almost unbounded influence in molding public opinion among a large portion of the people of Kentucky, and the recent Know-Nothing victory in this State, is to be attributed, almost wholly, to the energy displayed by him in the canvass. It may well be conceived, that such a man, turning, or pretending to turn, strongly anti-Catholic, would be able to sway the minds of many, who, if they would but think for themselves, might possibly come to conclusions much nearer the truth, than those worked out for them by the editor of the *Journal*.

Knowing the utter falsity of the charges brought against the Roman Catholics of this country by the leaders of the Know-Nothing party, among whom Mr. PRENTICE was recognized as the foremost, and believing that, possibly, some of my Protestant-fellow citizens might be disposed to weigh with fairness such evidences in disproof of the slanders brought against us as were within my reach, I commenced, in August last, the series of Letters herein contained. They have been hurriedly written, in moments snatched from business, and, as I am well aware, will afford to the reader but little beyond a plain statement of facts, and an unvarnished picture of the new, and as I conceive, dangerous doctrine, which fanaticism is seeking to blend with the political action of our hitherto free and happy people.

I contend that the nature of our civil institutions, to insure their permanency, requires the full recognition, by every true American, of entire freedom of conscience; and that no member of any church, sect, or denomination, should be made to feel, unless upon clear and positive testimony of treason to the State on the part of that religious body to which he may be attached, that his faith is a bar to any position, social or political, to which he may aspire. The leaders of the Know-Nothing party, though they have ran-

sacked, with untiring energy, every nook and corner of the land, in search of evidence to convict Roman Catholics of being enemies to republicanism, and therefore dangerous citizens, have failed to show a single instance wherein they have been, in any degree, justly accusable of being less true to the constitution and laws of their country than those who have made all this outcry against them. Foiled in their efforts to prove against the resident Roman Catholics of this country treason, either latent or open, these enemies to the Catholic faith have been obliged, in order to make some show of justification for having introduced into our political party issues so extraordinary an element as that of proscription because of religious faith, to have recourse to the stale slanders against Catholics, concocted and promulgated, hundreds of years ago, by men who were systematically taught to believe that the Pope was the anti-Christ, and that the religion of three-fourths of the Christian world, was nothing better than a system of superstition and tyranny. But the day is past for these things to be believed by men of sense. Roman Catholics are everywhere, and their acts can be measured. They embrace every class of men, from the most learned to the least tutored, and it requires more than the *ipse dixit* of popery-mad fanatics, and the interested speculations of unprincipled office-seekers and no-popery editors, who make merchandize of the prejudices of mankind, to render them suspected and despised. Proof before conviction, is not only a principle of law, but it embodies a sentiment innate to the American character; and though fanatics may rave of the intolerance and superstition of the Catholic Church, and attempt to throw ridicule on observances, of the nature of which they are profoundly ignorant, they must do something more than rant and declaim, before they can induce the conservative portion of the American people to act upon their wild and unreasonable suggestions.

The originators of the Know-Nothing movement were of course compelled to indicate some motives for their action, more or less plausible, in order to induce any considerable

numbers of the American people to join with them. The most important of these motives is the charge brought against Roman Catholics, that they acknowledge a divided allegiance incompatible with their duty as good citizens. This is the same accusation which was alleged against the Catholics of the mother country, during the pendency of the Catholic Relief Bill, more than sixty years ago, and which, after receiving a most minute examination from a committee of the House of Commons, was pronounced false by the Parliament of Great Britain. It must be remembered, that the writers in the interests of the Know-Nothing organization have not pretended to instance a single example going to show, in the remotest degree, that Catholics have been found wanting in true allegiance to the constitution and laws of their country. Their whole argument is based on the fact, that Roman Catholics, throughout the world, acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. The very term *spiritual* used by the Church to indicate the character of the Pope's supremacy, should be sufficient to show these men, were they disposed to be at all candid, that his claim of supremacy cannot possibly embrace any allegiance which the State has a right to demand. The constitution expressly disclaims the right to control matters outside of the temporal order. "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It appears clearly from this, that the framers of the constitution intended to forbid all legislation which had for its object the restriction of the rights of conscience. What is conscience? It is that principle implanted in our souls by the Deity, for the purpose of directing our spiritual natures to the accomplishment of His will. Human laws which contravene the law of conscience, cannot bind it; they have power over the bodies of men, but none over conscience, except in so far as they command things not opposed to the law by which it is governed. This is a principle of general application, which Catholics and Protestants are bound alike to uphold.

But these men assume, that because Catholics acknowledge

the right of the Pope to decide, for them, all questions of conscience, that, therefore, he may at any time decide that the constitution and laws of a State are opposed to the Law of God. This is sheer nonsense. What is a decision? It is an award upon a contested point, pronounced by a tribunal recognized as authoritative by the parties at whose instance and for whose benefit it is rendered. A decision in the spiritual order, supposes, either the pre-existence of a doubt in the mind of the applicant for its rendition, or else two distinct parties, with contrary opinions, but who yet recognize the authority of a given tribunal to decide on the contested point. Do not the Presbyterians hold that the General Assembly of their sect, has power for them, to decide upon all mooted questions touching the doctrines and discipline of their church? And if this is a dangerous doctrine as applied in their own way by Catholics, is it not equally dangerous as applied in theirs by Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and the half hundred different other Christian denominations of the land? The mere accidental location of the tribunal obviously does not affect the principle itself here unfolded. The Pope's authority being wholly spiritual, cannot possibly come in conflict with the civil affairs of this country, unless upon the contingency of the State's wantonly trampling on the rights of conscience. Do the leaders of the Know-Nothing movement seriously contemplate such a contingency? Do they anticipate the arrival of a day when every city of our land shall have its contiguous Smithfield, where State religion recusants are to be hanged, drawn and quartered? Their entire action seems to have for its object just such a state of things.

What right have these men to suppose that Roman Catholics are desirous of changing the nature of our government? The assumption that they are necessarily, and because of their religion, opposed to republicanism, is totally baseless. The principles upon which our free institutions are formed are precisely those the Catholic Church recognizes, as the very best for the promotion of the interests of religion. These

insure to her "a fair field and no favor," and this is all that she asks from any government ; but this even Catholic governments do not always accord to her. Catholicity is no new system ; the obligations it imposes on conscience are fixed, and it is not at all supposable that the framers of the constitution did not recognize these obligations, and fully weigh the question of their compatibility with our republican institutions. There has been no change in Catholic Church policy since the adoption of the constitution, and Catholics, as Catholics, have never attempted to control National or State legislation. They have not endeavored to influence Congressional action in accordance with their own peculiar religious views, as did a certain Protestant denomination in reference to the Sunday mails. Their ministers have not thought it incumbent on them to petition Congress against the passage of laws deemed necessary for the interests of our common country, as did the three thousand Protestant preachers of New England during the pendency of the Nebraska Kansas Bill. They have not introduced religious questions into the party politics of the day, nor presented to the world the spectacle of a divided Church on geographical limits, as have the principal Protestant societies, because their members could not think alike on the slavery question. It would seem to be a quality of Know-Nothing reasoning, that those only are to be suspected who have given no cause for suspicion.

What do the leaders of the new party mean, when they speak of "a pure American Christianity ?" Do they wish to intimate, that God's Law requires in England, what it forbids in Russia ; or that a sin committed in Italy may become a virtue when enacted in Kentucky ? The Apostles were commanded to *teach all nations*, and as nationality supposes different forms of civil polity, it follows that the doctrines and morality which these Apostles were to teach, must have been of such a character as to render them equally adaptable to all of these distinct forms. True Christianity is not unsuited to any form of government, and if American

Christianity would not be true Christianity in any other land then it is not the Christianity of the gospel. And so, I argue, of any form of Christianity of any land; if transplanting changes its nature, you may very safely conclude, that it is not a Divine, but a human institution.

Those that have read both sides of the controversy between the editor of the Louisville Journal and myself, cannot have failed to notice, that though Mr. PRENTICE has brought charges against the Catholics of this country, and particularly against the Bishops, of holding opinions and obligations at variance with the fealty due by them to the constitution and laws, he has failed to sustain these charges by any proof whatever. Hence, in order to divert the public mind from the real issue, he has not hesitated to introduce into the discussion unnecessary and uncalled for strictures upon the *religion* of the Roman Catholics. Professing to desire for them entire freedom of worship, he, singularly enough, finds no other way to induce people to suspect their loyalty to the government, than by caricaturing their faith. If Catholics were really unfavorable to our institutions, can any man believe, that during the eighty years which have elapsed since the formation of the government, no single act of a Roman Catholic could be pointed to tending to the establishment of such a charge? The conduct of our enemies, in attacking our religion, when they should, to be consistent, attack our anti-republican acts, is a sure indication that they can get hold of no such acts to form the basis of an attack. But they are again inconsistent, for while they profess to desire perfect freedom of worship to Catholics, they make this very worship their only motive for depriving them of their civil privileges. They tell you, we only seek to deprive Roman Catholics of the right to hold office. But will their action, if they really intend to stop here, have the effect they desire? Catholics are not all fools; and if they find themselves living in communities, where they are looked upon by the mass of their fellow-citizens as either open or covert enemies, they will be compelled, for the sake of peace, to form communities

of their own people, in different parts of the country, where, having popular majorities, they will be forced into the offices within the gift of such communities. Thus will be brought about the very state of things which the members of the new organization affect so much to deprecate. But, as I have elsewhere indicated, the outcry raised by these men against the Roman Catholics of the United States, is nothing but a sham, gotten up for the promotion of the political aspirations of a few unscrupulous demagogues and party hacks, the sum total of whose interests in the institution of Christianity itself, may be measured by the phrase, "the loaves and fishes."

Know-Nothingism seeks to keep the Catholics out of office. Are Roman Catholics greedy of holding official positions? You, my Protestant fellow-citizens, know that such is not the case. But suppose they had their fair share of the public places, instead of holding, as they do, scarcely one office in a hundred, what evils to the country could these Catholic office-holders possibly bring about? I can imagine none, unless they became peculators on the public purse, a charge, which, so far as I am advised, has never been brought against them. I am wholly unable to see, that the Catholic county-clerk, the Catholic magistrate, or the Catholic member of the legislature, would possess any better means of fomenting treason, than the Catholic lawyer, or merchant, or physician. But these gentlemen, who claim for themselves all the patriotism of the land, begin by asserting that a Catholic shall not be elevated to any office of honor or profit within their gift; and their next step will naturally be, that none of the faithful shall be allowed to employ a Catholic lawyer or physician, or purchase of a Catholic tradesman. If I am unfit, because of my faith, to record a deed as county-clerk, I am equally unfit, because of this same faith, to file a bill, as a lawyer, or bandage a broken limb, as a surgeon. The mind naturally reasons, that if a man ought to be proscribed as to one of his privileges, he is unworthy to exercise any privilege at all. The Know-Nothing party, if successful, cannot stop with depriving Catholics of the privilege to hold office. The ball

which its advocates seek to set in motion, is at the top of an inclined plain, and the slightest impetus will send it crashing and thundering on its destructive course, till every civil privilege and every religious right of the Roman Catholic will be obliterated.

Nor can the evil influence of such mad-brained folly end with the prostration of the Roman Catholics. Bigotry is insatiable, and its appetites will not be satisfied till other victims are immolated on its altar. And here, our once free and happy people are to witness a war of sects. Is it the Methodist, or the Unitarian, or the Episcopalian, who is next to feel the stripes of this rod of proscription? Protestants of America! follow to its legitimate results the idea I have indicated for your consideration, and decide for yourselves if it be wise or Christian to seek the abridgment of the rights of conscience. Consider the evils which a war of creeds must necessarily bring upon the whole community. These evils, in the moral order alone, should cause all well-disposed men to pause and reflect. Among them, not the least will be the indoctrination of a large portion of our population, and particularly the young, with an insane hatred for men, fashioned as themselves, and for whose salvation, no less than for that of others, the Redeemer came into the world, and suffered and was nailed to the cross. This passion, you must acknowledge, is repugnant to the Christian character; but it is one, you must also acknowledge, inseparable from a war of races or creeds. The most casual observer need but look around him, in order to convince himself, that already this dangerous indoctrination is going on at a fearful rate. You must recollect, that very many of those who have been influenced to side against the recognition of the civil rights of Roman Catholics, are not professors of religion; that fewer still have a correct understanding of that eternal law of love, which forms the basis of true Christianity, and that most of these are practically unable to discern the distinction between a certain faith and the worshipers attached to it. Hence have taken place the numerous outbreaks already recorded

against the Know-Nothing party, and which have involved the lives and property of Roman Catholics. That there are many attached to the new party who are capable of seeing and rightly appreciating the distinction to which I refer, I have no doubt ; still, these do not indicate the rule; but only the exception. Fanaticism is the blindest of all passions, and those who are under its dominion have no power to weigh the consequences of their actions. Influenced by its baneful spirit, the most revolting crimes present to the eyes of the fanatic the appearance of angelic virtues. Many Protestants assume that Roman Catholics are fanatical ; but this is only an assumption, and, as I contend, a false one. Still, even were it true, is not fanaticism a sin ?—and are not those who are seeking to implant it in the minds of the Protestants of this country guilty of the same crime they deprecate in the Roman Catholic ? How can they justify in themselves what they condemn in others ?

The Know-Nothing editors are much in the habit of charging upon the foreign portion of the population that they are frequently a cost to our corporations, and they attempt to prove this charge by exhibiting the quarterly reports of the poor-house and hospital wardens. This is clearly an unfair mode of reckoning. Our own citizens seldom engage in those avocations, wherein their health or lives are exposed to more than ordinary danger. The exposed situations of labor are always filled by foreigners, and principally by the much-abused Irish. Who are they that build our railroads and wharves, and drain our marsh lands ? Who are they that pave our streets, dig our wells and cisterns, and do all the rough labor upon our public and private buildings ? All, or nearly all, are Irish. It is but natural, then, that those so much exposed, and unavoidably so, should be subject not only to accidents to life and limb, but that they should also contract diseases inseparable from constant exposure in our climate. Such being the case, it is not at all wonderful that in the midst of such a population, there should be frequent instances of broken down constitutions and helpless families.

The question naturally presents itself—are the works, upon which our foreign born population find employment, necessary works? We are bound to conclude that the American people deem them necessary, as they are undertaken at their own instance, and for their own benefit; and if this be so, where is the justice in charging upon some of these people that they are a tax on our corporations, in the face of the fact, that they have lost in the service of these very corporations the ability to provide for themselves? I have myself been often taunted by Protestants, some of whom, at least, to my personal knowledge, were indebted to the labor of foreigners for their present affluence, with the fact that a large proportion of the public and private charities of our own city are contributed for the benefit of Irish Catholics; and one of these gentlemen, who bears the character of a Christian philanthropist, very pointedly intimated that “Catholics ought to support their own poor.” If Roman Catholics were in the habit of shirking the duty of charity, there might possibly be some show of reason for these taunts; but this is not the case. The Church teaches the exercise of charity as a matter of positive obligation, nor do I believe that Catholics, according to their ability, are justly chargeable with omitting this duty. The Catholic poor in our cities, doubtless, are in greater relative proportion than the Protestant poor, but, at the same time, the Protestant rich are in greater relative proportion than the Catholic rich. If a single rich Roman Catholic, in an otherwise exclusively Protestant community, would be justly exempt from the obligation of charity, then, it is possible, the reasoning which would teach that each denomination shall support its own poor, is good reasoning. The merest tyro in Christian ethics, however, could never be influenced by such reasoning. He sees a parallel to it in the Book of Genesis, where it is recorded of Cain, the first murderer, that being questioned by the Almighty in reference to his brother Abel, he answered, with studied hypocrisy: “I know not; am I my brother’s keeper?”

Here is the question plainly stated: Our citizens are

interested in the prosecution of certain public and private works, and finding none among themselves willing or able to undergo the hard labor and dangers to health and life, incidental to their accomplishment, are compelled to draw their operatives from the ranks of our adopted citizens. Some of these have died at their posts, and left helpless widows and orphan children without resources in a strange land; and others have contracted diseases, and must either be cared for by public or private charity, or be left to die in utter destitution. Shall those who engaged these poor persons in the dangerous avocations wherein life or health was lost, plead exemption from the obligation of charity towards the widows, and orphans, and invalids, become such in their own service? Is it honest, or fair, that Roman Catholics shall be taunted with furnishing so many objects of public and private charity, in the face of the notorious fact, that the blood, and tears, and destitution, and death, met with among the poor Irish of our cities, is but the natural result, in our climate, of the labor and exposure incidental to those avocations in which they have been employed by Americans and Protestants?

While upon this subject, let me remark, that American Catholics are as much opposed to the reception into this country of European paupers as any other religious body in the land. The system pursued by some of the European governments to impose upon us the worthless portion of their populations, including criminals and paupers, is one which every Catholic will denounce as highly reprehensible, and which justly calls for such legislative action as will effect its abatement. But the honest and hardy laborer, who seeks within our wide domain a home for life, even though unpossessed, upon his arrival, of means to insure a week's support, is no pauper. Take him as a mere man-machine, and his bones, and muscles, and sinews, are so much capital, and these, invested in the Bank of Labor, will return a dividend to the aggregate prosperity of the country, more permanently useful, than would the importation, in his stead, of a thousand dollars in gold. Look not, then, my Protestant fellow-coun-

trymen, on the poor Irish or German laborer as one out of place in our free land. It is here, precisely, that he is wanted. He may have faults ; but he has also virtues. Contempt for his poverty, and too rigorous exactions on account of his faults, can never have any good effect to relieve the one or correct the other. Kindness and consideration may raise him in the scale of humanity ; ill-treatment and distrust will not fail to lower, in that scale, both him and yourselves.

It is observable, that those editors who are now advocating the interests of the Know-Nothing organization, but a few years ago, were engaged in singing pæans over Louis Kosuth, the ex-governor of Hungary who was at that very time endeavoring to involve our government in difficulties with foreign powers. The "foreign influence" spoken of by several of the fathers of the republic, and against which they cautioned the American people, was here before the eyes of these very patriotic editors, but until Henry Clay, whose memory I delight to honor, indicated to his revolutionary Excellency that he was going beyond the spirit of our institutions, not one word of rebuke did these self-constituted guardians of republicanism utter against the artful and meddling Hungarian. But now, they boldly proclaim, that the caution against "foreign influence" by Washington and Jefferson, had reference to our foreign-born citizens — to those who have cast their lot for life amongst us, and who have necessarily the same interest in the prosperity and happiness of the country as the native-born population.

Again, these same editors, during the recent visit to this country of Archbishop BEDINI, the Papal Nuncio, joined with the infidel German radicals of Cincinnati, and elsewhere, in villifying the Archbishop for his supposed action against what they termed Italian liberty. In vain did American Catholics protest against the exhibition of a wild and reckless fanaticism towards one charged with a peaceful mission to our government ; in vain did the Nuncio deny the slanders propagated against him ; in vain did high-minded and candid Protestants endeavor to set the matter in its true

light. The editors were dumb; and if there ever did appear in any of the newspapers conducted by these now exceedingly Christian gentlemen, a single paragraph of reprehension of the conduct of a band of avowed infidels, who openly sought the life of the Nuncio, I have no recollection of having seen it. But a change has come over these editors. The German infidel and the Irish Catholic, though antagonistic as water and oil, are now put in the same scale. If the foreign infidel fulminates against the head of the government his manifesto for having acknowledged that thanks were due to Almighty God for preserving us in peace and filling the land with blessings, the foreign-born Roman Catholic, though recognizing in all its force the idea indicated by the language of the President, is at once, because of his foreign birth, classed with the radical and atheist, and made to bear an opprobrium which only attaches to the latter. If the dispute lies between the *Freimanner* and the Catholics, the sympathies of these eminently Protestant editors is all on the side of the infidel; but when foreign radicals are guilty of attempts to revolutionize American institutions, the foreign-born Roman Catholic, who never had a sympathy with their agrarian notions, is set down as their aidor and abettor.*

It has been so often stated by the enemies of the Catholic Church, that she is the foe to all progress, that the idea seems to have become a fixture, as it were, in the Protestant mind. There is an obvious reason for this prejudice. Most of our literature is derived from anti-Catholic sources. In England, until within a comparatively short time, Catholics were by law forbidden to engage in those pursuits which lead to eminence. They were not allowed to print or publish, and

*Since writing the above, I have seen it stated, that in the recent elections in New York and some others of the eastern cities, the foreign radical element of the population voted with the Know-Nothings. This is as it should be. These men have at last found their true position. When the editor of the Louisville Journal recently attempted to classify these men with the Roman Catholics, as being antagonistic to the Know-Nothing organization, he was not, most likely, aware of the fusion that was being consummated between his party and German radicalism.

consequently, the aspersions upon Catholic faith and practice, thus of necessity left uncontradicted, came, in the course of time, to be viewed as "confirmation strong as proofs from Holy Writ," against the Church. This being the case for over two centuries, can it be wondered at, that the minds of men should be filled with almost irradicable prejudices in reference to a system of religion everywhere spoken against, and whose upholders were afraid, on account of the laws in force for its suppression, to whisper even a mild defense? The common people, always greedy of that kind of reading which gave excitement to their passions, were plied with horrible tales of monkish superstition and fanaticism, written by men who knew that they were not only catering to a morbid feeling of hatred of Catholicity general among the masses, but that they were, also, in almost every page of their writings, circulating glaring and palpable falsehoods. The prejudices thus engendered and kept alive have come down to us, from father to son, and from generation to generation, so that, even in our day, there are many, who, though they have never read a Catholic book, or heard a Catholic sermon, or entered a Catholic church, or even had a Catholic neighbor, have no other idea of Catholicity than that it is a system of crude fanaticism, if not of open rebellion against God.

Occasionally, here and there, a strong intellect might be found, much to the surprise of the Protestant community, to give up his prejudices, and attach himself to the old Church. The excuses given for these instances of what evangelicals called perversion, were always of such a character, that those outside the Church were still satisfied that Protestantism itself was not to be held accountable for them. They were crazy, or had been operated on by improper motives; and, even to this day, when no other conceivable motive for conversion to Catholicity, except that of a desire to uphold the truth, can be indicated, the converts are held by many to be deranged in their intellects. Of late years, however, there has been going on, in the very heart of Protestantism itself,

a yearning for something unattainable within the limits of its jarring domain. Men have begun to feel the necessity of unity, and to aspire after peace. Wearied with its flight over a sea of doubt and distrust, the dove seeks again to rest its drooping wings in the ark of the Church of God.

Those who speak so flippantly, and write so fluently against the Catholic Church, either do not know themselves, or do not wish others to know how many benefits this much abused Church and its members have conferred on society. The old adage says, "ignorance is bliss," and if this be so, then the state of extreme felicity enjoyed by these carping gentlemen and their confiding dupes cannot be otherwise than wonderful. Never was there a more striking exemplification of the confidence inspired by ignorance, or by that "little learning which is a dangerous thing," than that lately presented by the tribe of politicians suddenly turned theologians, and by that other kindred tribe of preachers suddenly turned politicians. The former class have, however, made the most marvelous progress. Ignorant men, reared in the bush, and small-fry village politicians, at the cry of *the Pope! the Pope!* have suddenly started forth, armed *cap a pie* with historical and theological weapons, and with every hair in their empty heads erect with inspiration! Some of these men, unused to so great a pressure on their very limited modicum of brains, are already mad, and an indefinite number of them are but a few degrees removed from the same sad state. Truly, we have fallen on an enlightened age, in which insanity has been installed into the position of teacher and guide.

Have these men, or those who take their statements on trust, ever read history? Have they ever traced on the historic page the gradual progress of modern civilization? Have they learned by what successive steps, and by whose agency, Christianity was spread over the world? Have they inquired, to whom we are indebted for much of the advancement of literature, and for most of the great discoveries and inventions in science and in the arts, the comforts of which we are now reaping in so great abundance? If they have

not, then, for their own sakes, if for no other consideration, they should be silent, until they acquire a little information. To reason with the fanatic and the bigot is but a waste of time ; but for the benefit of the conservative and truth-loving portion of my fellow-citizens,—by far the largest portion of the community — I have collected, from different published works, a condensed statement of what we owe to the Catholic Church and to its members, in the several departments of Religion, Civilization, Literature and the Arts, and in Political Institutions.

I. RELIGION. We owe to the Catholic Church the preservation of the Bible, through storm and revolution, through barbarian invasions and civil feuds, for fifteen centuries preceding the period of the so called reformation. No one acquainted with history, can deny that the first Protestants received the Sacred Scriptures from the hands of that very Church, which they were pleased nevertheless to denounce as the constant enemy of the Bible! And, along with the Bible, Protestants received from the Catholic Church all those great principles, institutions, and traditions of Christianity, which they choose to designate as *fundamental*, and which are admitted by all “orthodox” Christians. Not only this, but all Protestants of the present day owe it to the Catholic Church, that they are descendants of a Christian instead of a Pagan ancestry; for all history proclaims the fact, that every nation that was ever converted from Paganism to Christianity was so converted by Catholic missionaries, acting in communion with the Roman See, and generally armed with the broad seal of the Papal commission! Is it not supremely absurd to hear men rail out so bitterly against a Church to which they owe so much — in fact, everything — which causes them to be Christians at all, and without whose beneficial influence on the minds and hearts of their ancestors, they would probably have been reared heathens instead of Christians!

II. CIVILIZATION. Our revilers equally forget what we owe to the Catholic Church in the department of general civili-

zation. Without her agency, the world would, in all probability, never have been civilized at all. Alone and single-handed, she for centuries successfully stemmed the rushing tide of barbarism, which threatened society with dissolution. After having converted the Northmen, whose descendants now constitute the bulk of the most civilized nations, she set about the noble work of controlling their passions, directing their morals, humanizing their manners, and developing their naturally vigorous intellectual powers. Her patient labor of love was rewarded with the most abundant fruits. Fierce wolves were gradually changed into lambs of her flock. Tyranny and licentiousness were curbed, and freedom was enabled to breathe more freely among the down-trodden masses. *Serfism*, or that degrading species of white slavery which was closely intertwined with the feudal system, was gradually abolished wherever the influence of the Catholic Church could extend, or her voice could be heard; and millions of poor slaves thus became freemen. In reality, we owe it mainly to her agency that we were born freemen instead of slaves. Yet more. To her is woman principally indebted for the exalted position she now occupies in society. The Church found her, a slave, but raising the degraded daughter of Eve, before doomed to an ignoble vassalage, to the dignity of the daughter of Mary, she placed her as the equal of man, and gave to her that Christian freedom, which is "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

III. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS. Do our maligners know what the Catholic Church has done for mankind in this department? If not, let them glance at the following summary of their indebtedness, and blush, for very shame, at their past ignorance or dishonesty.

1. We owe to the Church the preservation of that considerable portion of ancient classical literature which has descended to us, and which would probably have perished but for the patient and zealous labors of her clergy and monks, who devoted much of their time to the transcription of manuscripts.

2. We owe to Catholics all our modern languages, which

sprung up and were carried to considerable perfection during what are called "the dark ages," long before the era of the boasted reformation.

3. Our modern poetry, which has since been greatly perfected, received its first beginning and its early development during the middle ages, when for the first time, rhythm or rhyme was introduced into poetry.

4. The paper on which we write, the noble art of printing, which has diffused thought over the world, and the postoffice which has so greatly facilitated intercommunication among mankind, are all of Catholic origin.

5. The principal colleges and universities of Europe were founded by Catholics, and it was they, in fact, who first originated the idea of an university, as well as that of literary societies.

6. Catholic missionary zeal, in early ages, led to numerous discoveries in geography, and thereby gave that powerful stimulus to commerce which has since resulted so beneficially to the world.

7. It was a Catholic who discovered the mariner's compass, and, through its agency, rendered widely extended commerce possible.

8. Guided by the unerring magnetic needle, the Catholic Columbus discovered the continent which we inhabit, and other Catholic mariners — Vespucci, the Cabots, Cabrals, &c., — completed what Columbus had so well begun.

9. The musical notes of the *gamut*, which have furnished an alphabet to musical sounds, and rendered music a science, are the invention of a Catholic monk, Guido d'Arezzo.

10. The organ, and other musical instruments, have a similar origin, as well as bells in churches and town-halls.

11. We owe to Catholics the first introduction of glass as an article of domestic convenience, and we are indebted to them likewise for the beautiful art of staining glass, which has since been partially lost.

12. It was a Catholic monk, Schwarz of Cologne, who first invented — or at least introduced into Europe — gun-

powder, that terrible agent which has since exerted so powerful an influence over the destinies of mankind.

13. It was a Catholic, too, the monk Gerbert, who first introduced among Europeans the Arabic numbers, which we now use, and which are indispensable in all modern calculation; and it is to Catholics we are indebted for the first development of the sciences of arithmetic and algebra.

14. It was another Catholic monk, Salvino of Pisa, who invented the lenses or glasses by which the old are enabled to read, and the short-sighted are relieved from their distressing infirmity.

15. The clock and the watch are both Catholic inventions; the former of the tenth, the latter of the fourteenth century.

16. Finally, we owe to Catholics the revival of the beautiful art of painting; the discovery or invention of the art of engraving; the discovery of the Galvanic fluid, named after its discoverer, Dr. Galvani; the introduction of silk and its fabrics into Europe, and the discovery and perfecting of probably the most beautiful style of architecture—the Gothic.

We must blot from the pages of history all these incontestable facts, and many more of a kindred character, before we can excuse the flippant ignorance or blind prejudices of our modern crusaders against Catholicity. In their bitter and vulgar tirades, they are basely slandering their greatest benefactors, and outraging with vile maledictions the tombs of their own ancestors as well as ours. But I will now pass to the fourth and last department, referred to above—the one upon which our newly fledged theologians are wont to lay the greatest stress.

IV. POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS. We are told that the Catholic Church is the sworn enemy of all liberty, and the close ally of all despotism. Whole volumes of declamation have recently gone forth to the world on this prolific theme. Now what are the facts, as unfolded in faithful history? One prominent fact is often a sufficient answer to whole pages of declamatory assertion. Allow me to give you a few *facts* on this subject, which no well-read man will venture to deny, and the inference from which is obvious to the dullest capacity.

1. The Catholic Church and the Popes secured the triumph of the Cross over the Crescent, in that long and eventful struggle of a thousand years between the two rival banners, which decided the fate of Christian civilization and of human liberty among our ancestors. The Cross, upheld by the Popes, and by brave Catholic soldiers, animated to the contest by their eloquent voice, finally triumphed over the Crescent, and the result of this victory was the securing of European independence from the crushing yoke of Mahommedan despotism. Had the contest terminated differently, all liberty and all civilization would have disappeared from the earth, and, in this case, the development of free institutions would have been simply an impossibility. Thus, we clearly owe it to the Catholic Church and to the Popes, that it was *possible* for our ancestors and for ourselves to be freemen. But for the triumph of the Cross over the Crescent, our condition would now probably be similar to that of those countries in Asia and Africa which are at present, and have been for centuries, bowed down in the dust under the Mahommedan fanaticism, with all its attendant social evils.

2. We are in the habit of boasting of such political institutions as trial by jury, exemption from taxation without previous representation, regular courts for the administration of justice, and the personal security provided for by the *habeas corpus*. Now, do our revilers ever have the honesty to state to their dupes, that all these precious political rights, which lie at the basis of all liberty, are, *every one of them*, of Catholic origin? Oh, no! They would thereby ruin their pet-theory of Papal tyranny and Catholic despotism! Yet every one knows that all these institutions were established by Catholics, more than three hundred years before Protestantism was ever heard of.

3. The theory of our opponents would lead one to believe, that wherever Catholicity prevails, and is predominant, no political liberty, and especially no republic, could exist. What is the fact? It is as undeniable as it is important, that Catholic communities founded ALL the republics which

ever existed in the world in Christian times, up to the date of our own — 1776. The Catholic Church may, in fact, be styled the mother of republics. In the twelfth century there sprang up, under the fostering care of the Popes, the Italian republics of Venice, Genoa, Florence, Sienna, and others, and in the fourteenth century, the Swiss Cantons, under the guidance of William Tell and his associates, established their free confederation, which subsists to the present day. The two little republics of St. Marino, in Italy, and of Andorra, in Spain, were founded, the first by a Catholic monk, in the fourth century, and the second by a Catholic Bishop, in the ninth. The former is the oldest republic in the world, and one of the most radical in its democracy. What is most remarkable about it, is the fact, that it is surrounded by the Papal territory, and that the Popes have always been the vigilant guardians and protectors of its independence.

4. We are told that all free institutions had their origin in what is called the Reformation. What says history on this subject? Prussia has been Protestant for three hundred years, and though she has had a shadow of a constitution since 1848, she is, and always has been, a wretched despotism, with Church and State united. Sweden and Denmark have been blessed with the reformed religion for three centuries, and Sweden and Denmark are no better off than Prussia. The same may be said of Holland, with some modification, introduced only since the revolutions of 1848. The Reformation in England rather depressed than elevated popular liberty; the crown over-awed and almost swallowed up every other element of government, from the date of the Reformation to the revolution in 1688—a period of one hundred and fifty years. The Reformation had full sway in many parts of the world, for two hundred and fifty years before our Declaration of Independence;—did it, during all this time, found a single republic, or even develop a single democratic principle before unknown? If so, when and where?

5. Was it Protestantism exclusively, which established

our own republic? Did we not have to struggle for our liberties against a Protestant government, and did not a great Catholic power step gallantly to our defense against our Protestant oppressor? Did not Catholics fight side by side with their Protestant brethren in our revolutionary war, and did they not behave as gallantly in the field as their associates? It would seem that Charles Carroll of Carrolton, a Roman Catholic, who ventured so much in the cause of American liberty, was permitted by Providence to survive all his colleagues, as if for the very purpose of rebuking the fanaticism which now seeks to deprive his co-religionists of their civil rights!

Does any man ask me why I am a Roman Catholic? If so, let him but study the history of the Church, and he will no longer wonder. Let him investigate her claims to the possession of those unerring evidences, which even human reason recognizes as *criteria* of truth, viz: Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity; — *Unity* of faith and practice; *Holiness* as to the doctrines taught and the morality inculcated; *Catholicity*, in carrying these saving doctrines, and this heavenly morality, to every quarter of the globe; *Apostolicity*, in being able to trace the line of her authorized teachers back to the Apostles of our Lord. Let him also study the beauty and appropriateness of her liturgy, and her religious ceremonial; let him, casting prejudice aside, follow that *via crucis* trod by the footsteps of her Saints in every age, and reflect on the holiness of that faith, which was able to induce the rich and the talented, the poor and the unlettered, the master and the slave, the king and the peasant, all alike, to strive, and to suffer, and to die, in order to uphold its truth. Let him do but this, and he will learn why it is that I cling with an abiding attachment to the faith of my fathers — to that eternal Church of God, wherein the Holy Spirit ever abideth. She it is that has set up land-marks, in every age of her existence, to be the guides of future generations in their search after truth. She it is that changes not, though all things else are ever changing. She it is that

ever existed in the world in Christian times, up to the date of our own — 1776. The Catholic Church may, in fact, be styled the mother of republics. In the twelfth century there sprang up, under the fostering care of the Popes, the Italian republics of Venice, Genoa, Florence, Sienna, and others, and in the fourteenth century, the Swiss Cantons, under the guidance of William Tell and his associates, established their free confederation, which subsists to the present day. The two little republics of St. Marino, in Italy, and of Andorra, in Spain, were founded, the first by a Catholic monk, in the fourth century, and the second by a Catholic Bishop, in the ninth. The former is the oldest republic in the world, and one of the most radical in its democracy. What is most remarkable about it, is the fact, that it is surrounded by the Papal territory, and that the Popes have always been the vigilant guardians and protectors of its independence.

4. We are told that all free institutions had their origin in what is called the Reformation. What says history on this subject? Prussia has been Protestant for three hundred years, and though she has had a shadow of a constitution since 1848, she is, and always has been, a wretched despotism, with Church and State united. Sweden and Denmark have been blessed with the reformed religion for three centuries, and Sweden and Denmark are no better off than Prussia. The same may be said of Holland, with some modification introduced only since the revolutions of 1848. The constitution in England rather depressed than elevated the crown, and the crown almost swallowed up the elements of free government.

our own republic? Did we not have our liberties against a Protestant power? Catholic power step gallantly as our Protestant oppressor? Did not the Catholics with their Protestant oppressors as our oppressors did they not behave as gallantly in the past? It would seem that Charles Carroll, a Catholic, who was a great champion of liberty, was persecuted by the Protestants, as if for the very purpose of which now we are fighting for the rights!

Does any man believe that I have so, let him tell me why he does so, no longer wonder. He is in his possession of the property of reason recognized as a Catholic, and a man of holiness as to the holiness of his life: *Catholicity*, in my opinion, is heavenly morality, and a just civility, in being able to go back to the *Golden Rule*, beauty and approach to the hearing, or, so ceremonial, in his paper, any crucifix used by the government. At no time had

of approbation, which they were as neighbors. At no of their fidelity to the regard them otherwise not to be. In the annual meeting of the Catholic, as a respectful, belief, and mere of his whole

July, 27th, 1855.

July, 27th, 185

gives heavenly strength to human weakness, and chooseth the foolish things of the world that she may confound the wise. She it is that has the gospel preached to the poor, and has no compromises for the rich and powerful. "I love, O Lord, the beauty of Thy house, and the place where Thy glory dwelleth." This religion, in the language of Cardinal Wiseman, "alone carries me back to the infancy of Christianity, and unites, in unbroken connection, through ages of fulfillment and prophecy, the creed which I profess, with the inspired visions of the earlier dispensation."

In conclusion, my Protestant countrymen, I can find no more fitting language in which to address you, than that used by the celebrated Father O'Leary, in his address to the Protestants of Great Britain in the last century: "What is to us the intolerance of past ages if we imitate it not? We are a new world raised on the ruins of the former, and if hitherto we could not agree as Christians, *it is high time to live together as men*. There is land enough for us all; and it is by far better to see towns and cities rearing their heads on the banks of our rivers, than to see our fertile country depopulated by intolerance. In vain do we give ourselves up to hatred and vengeance—we soon learn that such cruel pleasure was never adapted to the heart of man; that in hating others, we punish ourselves; that humanity disclaims violence, and that the law of God, in commanding us to love our neighbor, has consulted the most upright and reasonable dictates of the human heart."

Wishing "a long life and a happy death to all of Adam's children," permit me to subscribe myself,

Very sincerely, yours,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

INTRODUCTORY ARTICLES.

GEORGE D. PRENTICE AND CATHOLIC PROSCRIPTION.*

IN the year 1832, I became acquainted with GEO. D. PRENTICE, and since that time I have been a constant reader of his paper. I have not only had access to his opinions, (if I may so express myself,) as embodied in his various writings during nearly a quarter of a century; but I have also had frequent, and, during the first five years of our acquaintance, almost constant opportunities to hear, in his private conversations with his friends, his ideas upon a great variety of topics, political, social, and religious.

I need scarcely say, that Mr. PRENTICE's political predictions were also my own, and that I had always entertained for him the warmest regard. I believed him to be a man whose integrity was unimpeachable, and who would scorn to use, for any supposed political advantage, means not consistent with self-respect, a delicate sense of honor, and a just regard for the religious feelings, as well as the civil rights, of any portion of his fellow-citizens. At no time, till within the past two months, had he expressed in my hearing, or, so far as my observation has gone, recorded in his paper, any opinion savoring of apprehension of danger to the government on account of the Roman Catholics. At no time had he failed to accord to them their just meed of approbation, as good citizens of a government to which they were as warmly attached as were their Protestant neighbors. At no time had he intimated any suspicion of their fidelity to the Constitution and laws, or seemed to regard them otherwise than as men whose patriotism was not to be suspected. In his social intercourse with individual members of the Catholic Church, Mr. PRENTICE always appeared to be respectful, kind and courteous. Nor do I believe that this was a mere show of courtesy on the part of the editor. His whole

* Communicated to the "Louisville Daily Courier" of July, 27th, 1855.

course evidently exhibited the fact, that he felt his Catholic fellow-citizens were worthy of both confidence and respect.

Let us now contrast GEORGE D. PRENTICE, as I have known him for nearly twenty-four years, with this same GEORGE D. PRENTICE, new-born in the Know-Nothing party. The change is complete, but also most humiliating. Self-respect and consistency have both left him together; hatred is in his heart, and dissimulation on his tongue. It were sad to see the dethronement of a noble intellect, even when brought about by physical causes over which the possessor could have no control. But, oh! how much more sad, to see this same intellect debasing and prostituting its powers to unworthy ends! The *Louisville Journal*, to which we were wont to look for well seasoned, calm and logical articles upon the political topics of the day, now comes to us filled, morning after morning, with most unwarrantable and bitter denunciations of inoffensive and unoffending Catholics. And why? Not because of any personal injury they have done the editor, nor of any insult they have given him. Not because of any overt act of theirs against the laws. Not because of any combination by them for or against any set of men or political principles; but simply because—"oh, shame, where is thy blush?"—*because they choose to worship God as did their fathers before them!*

Is it not truly humiliating that, in this country, to which the editor's forefathers, as well my own, fled for the very object that they might worship God according to the dictates of their consciences—in a land, too, whose constitution, framed by wise men, positively forbids a religious test as a qualification for citizenship or office—a man can be found, claiming the right by his learning and talents to form public opinion, so callous to the teachings of the past, and so regardless of the future prosperity and happiness of his country, as to uphold for the favorable consideration of American freemen, *political proscription on account of religious faith?* The editor has no excuse for his course in this matter. The past of our country is before him. He has had Catholic friends and neighbors, whose whole lives would give the lie to the charge of their want of patriotism. He talks of "political Romanism." The editor must feel his cheek mantle with shame while he pens such miserable twaddle. Outside of the Pontifical States there is no such thing as political Romanism. There is not a Roman Catholic on this whole continent that owes civil or political alle-

giance to the Pope. The charge that they do, is a foul libel, a thousand times advanced and a thousand times refuted, and it has been used only by bigots and knaves, to inspire the ignorant with distrust of a body of Christians whose patriotism is not less pure than is that of any other denomination in the land.

Who, of all the signers of the Declaration of Independence, risked so much of worldly wealth by that act as did CHARLES CARROLL, of Carrollton, a Roman Catholic? Did Mr. PRENTICE ever hear of a Roman Catholic who thought Charles Carroll too patriotic? Can he name a single Roman Catholic who, either in his writings or in his public or private acts, has shown himself other than a true lover of the liberties of the country, as bequeathed to us by our fathers, and bought for us by the blood of Protestants and Catholics alike? If this be true—and that it is true no sane and right-hearted man will deny—what have the Roman Catholics done to call down upon them this mountain of obloquy from the editor of the Louisville Journal? Have they monopolized more than their share of the offices of honor and profit under the State or Federal Government? Not so. Roman Catholics are seldom office-seekers, and from that of President of the United States to the pettiest official position under a county magistracy, you will not find one Roman Catholic to fifty Protestant incumbents. Have those few Roman Catholics who have held, or do hold office, failed to discharge the duties of the same with honesty and fidelity? Have they used their offices to pander to the real or supposed interests of their co-religionists? No such charge has ever been made against them. Can the editor point out a single Roman Catholic official defaulter? I defy him to do so.

Are the Roman Catholics chargeable as citizens with qualities dangerous to the peace of communities? Are they less obedient to the laws, less honest, less charitable than their Protestant fellow-citizens? You never hear of them molesting a Protestant meeting, or attacking a Protestant church. They are not in the habit of insulting those who dissent from them.

Was the late PATRICK MAXCY any the worse citizen or patriot because he was a Catholic and an Irishman? Who that knows the Catholic LANCASTERS, and HAMILTONS, and ELDERS, and HANLEYS, and ABELLS, and SPALDINGS, and CLARKS, and RUDDS, and M'GILLS, of Kentucky, will dare

accuse them of not holding true allegiance to the constitution and laws of the country?

In conclusion, permit me to submit the following propositions, on the correctness of which Protestants may fully rely:

1st. The Roman Catholics of this country owe no civil allegiance to the Pope of Rome.

2d. The Roman Catholics of this country acknowledge full allegiance to the constitution and laws of the United States.

3d. There is nothing in the Roman Catholic religion inimical to the idea of civil and religious liberty, as held by the Protestants of this country.

4th. The Roman Catholics of this country would go as far to defend its liberties, from any foe whatever, as the best Protestant in the land.

5th. The Pope, if he had not a foot of ground which he might call his own, nor a single political adherent to yield him civil homage, would still be Pope, the head of the Catholic Church on earth, and the spiritual father of two hundred millions Catholic Christians, scattered over the whole earth.

6th. It is impossible for a Roman Catholic, who observes with fidelity the precepts of his faith, to be a traitor to his country.

7th. The man who impugns my patriotism on account of my religious opinions, is either an insane bigot who claims my pity, or a foul-mouthed slanderer who has my contempt.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

CATHOLICS PROSCRIBING THE LOUISVILLE JOURNAL.*

"Extended and systematic exertions have been made, and are now making, in a hundred quarters, to destroy the circulation of our paper. The Roman Catholics in particular, as was to be expected, not satisfied to withdraw their own subscriptions, are, upon various pretexts, endeavoring to persuade all around them to do the same. We think they are going beyond the bounds of legitimate warfare. Many of them seem to sigh, and groan, and gnash their teeth, that, instead of merely assailing our name, and our political influence, and our pecuniary interests, they cannot bring us to the faggot or the rack. But we are not in Rome, or Spain, or Mexico, and we think we can safely bid defiance, as we do, to Papal tyranny and persecution."

I CLIP the above from the leading editorial in the Louisville Journal of Tuesday last, August 14. A more barefaced and

* Communicated to the Louisville Daily Democrat of August 17.

flagrant outrage upon the feelings of a large denomination of Christians, and one more opposed to the commonest civilities of life, was never penned. From what quarter does Mr. PRENTICE draw the information that the Roman Catholics of Kentucky would, under any circumstances, desire to visit him with personal or pecuniary evils? The *new* commandment given by our blessed Saviour, wherein we are bidden to *love our enemies, and pray for them that calumniate and persecute us*, is of binding force upon the conscience of every true Catholic. We are taught to repay evil with good; and if Mr. PRENTICE himself raises a wall of separation between us, we are assuredly not responsible for the pecuniary evil, if any, thereby accruing to him. He says that it "was to be expected" that Catholics should give up his paper. In this he acknowledges, that his course towards that denomination has been of such a character as to *force* its members, even from the simple motive of self-respect, to the course indicated. His paper has vilified and traduced them, as men and as religionists; it has been filled with slanders of their faith, worded in most insulting language; it has attributed to them motives of action at war with every feeling of their hearts, and opposed to the whole tenor of their lives; it has raised up a spirit of distrust, ill-will, and, in some instances, of positive persecution against them, pervading a large portion of the community, and rendering their social existence one of constant fear and apprehension. All this it has done, and surely there is cause enough for their refusal any longer to receive the paper into their houses. By his own acts the editor has prevented them from giving him their patronage, unless at the expense not only of self-respect, but also of the positive duty which they owe to their families, that such reading shall be kept from them as it is likely to contaminate their faith or morals. But when GEORGE D. PRENTICE charges Roman Catholics with a desire to injure him in person or in pocket, he simply asserts that which is an *unmitigated fable*; and the appeal which he makes to his party, based upon the abominable slander, is of such a character—so extremely little and contemptible—that it is hard to believe it had its emanation from a sane mind.

I had hoped that when the fever and excitement consequent upon a hotly contested election had passed away, the Louisville Journal's anti-Catholic ebullitions would also cease. I had hoped that the awful consequences of the late terrible riots would have taught the editor, that it is a fearful thing

to aid in the spread of dissensions based upon differences of religious belief. That such has not been the case, I have no other feeling than one of profound sorrow. In the continuance of the course which Mr. PRENTICE seems to have marked out for himself, I can see nothing but evil to the whole community—Protestant as well as Catholic—both in its social relations and in its business affairs. The human heart, when uninfluenced by passion, is ever longing for peace. Distrust of their Catholic fellow-citizens cannot give happiness to Protestants; and the fear of the violence of the mob, and the feeling that their patriotism is doubted, and that the motives of all their actions are misconstrued and misrepresented, must have the effect to cause Catholics to seek a more safe and quiet home elsewhere. I speak for myself, when I say, that no inducements of pecuniary advantage would sway me for one moment in choosing between a residence in the land of my birth, and the consequent evils which attachment to my faith would, under such circumstances, render certain, and complete expatriation. Roman Catholics ask no immunities, other than those which the constitution allows to all alike. They claim no exclusive privileges. They ask only that they be let alone, so long as they obey the laws.

I have still hopes that the better judgment of Mr. PRENTICE will cause him to cease a warfare which can bring nothing but disgrace on the American name, and unheard of evils upon our city. Let him but read again the paragraph at the head of this article. He must see how unworthy it is of his reputation. We naturally look for such sentiments from the mouths of the *angel Gabriels* of the land; but God help us when they are filched from their insensate and bigoted originators, to be used by men of sense and judgment.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

LETTERS TO GEO. D. PRENTICE, ESQ.

LETTER FIRST.

SIR:—In many of your late editorials you refer, in justification of the course you have thought proper to pursue towards Roman Catholics, to what you term “the political aggressions of the papal hierarchy.” May I ask of you the favor to instance some of these aggressions? I have been a somewhat attentive observer of the actions of the members of this same hierarchy in the United States, and I am compelled to acknowledge that I have failed to recognize the aggressions you speak of. What is their specific character? Being *political*, as you say, they must consist either in overt acts against the constitution and laws, or else treasonable endeavors on the part of the hierarchy tending to the subversion of the constitution, and to rendering the laws inoperative.

Since your residence in Louisville, you have had opportunities to make the acquaintance of at least four individuals of the “papal hierarchy.” The first of these was the late venerable BISHOP FLAGET, a missionary, when Kentucky was almost a wilderness—a man whose whole life was an example of charity and good-will, and who was esteemed and beloved by all who knew him, Protestants as well as Catholics. Will you, Mr. PRENTICE, have the kindness to indicate when and where Bishop FLAGET was guilty of *political aggressions*!

And the second, the late Bishop of Charleston, Rt. Rev. I. A. REYNOLDS. He was a native of Kentucky, and for many years served the Fifth street congregation in this city. The only aggressions to which Dr. REYNOLDS could have possibly plead guilty—and I knew him most intimately—were those that he made upon the poverty and destitution which he found in the habitations of the poor of his flock. He made war upon these with all the energy of his noble heart.

The third and fourth of this feared hierarchy are the present Bishop of Richmond, Va., Rt. Rev. JOHN M’GILL, and your “friend” Bishop SPALDING, of this city. They are both *natives*, and both well known here and elsewhere. Again, will

you, Mr. PRENTICE, instance the political aggressions of these Bishops? I have every reason to believe that you know them well, and as you have charged the American papal hierarchy with being political aggressors, it is but fair that you should make specifications. If these men are guilty as you charge them, you owe it to your own character to prove them so. If, however, you find that you cannot substantiate your charges against them, as I have perfect confidence you cannot, then, in the name of all that is fair and honest, cease abusing them.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, or the Catholic people over whom they have been placed, have in any instance given cause for the charge of *political aggression*.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that Roman Catholics are unfriendly to the government and constitution of the United States.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that there now exists, or ever did exist, on this continent, a body of men more thoroughly imbued with deep reverence and love for the constitution of the United States than the Roman Catholics now living within the limits of these States.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, and the clergy under their jurisdiction, have ever prostituted their pulpits to political purposes, or that they have used the influence, incidental to their offices in the Church, for the furtherance of political ends, whether for one party or another.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that in those places in this country where Roman Catholics have popular majorities, they have ever endeavored to monopolize the offices, or have shown the slightest disposition to be *aggressive*.

I deny—and I challenge the proof to the contrary—that the Roman Catholics of the United States do now hold one-tenth part of the offices of trust and profit which their numerical strength fairly entitles them to; and I affirm, from this fact, that they are at least *nine times less aggressive* upon the public purse than are their Protestant fellow-citizens. As one proof of this, permit me to cite the city of Louisville. We have here a population of say seventy thousand souls; of these there are certainly not less than fifteen thousand Roman Catholics. I suppose that I will not be far from the mark, in estimating the number of persons in the public pay

at one hundred. Among them, the only Roman Catholic aggressor upon the city treasury, is one young lady teacher of the public schools, who was *accidentally* re-elected by the Board of Education—the Know-Nothing majority of that board not having been aware of her “Catholic proclivities.” Here, then, in our own city, where a fair representation would entitle the Roman Catholics to more than one-fifth of the public offices, they are officially represented in a ratio as of one to one hundred. This is no isolated case. Almost an equal disparity of representation will be found from one end of the Union to the other. Roman Catholics have never complained of this. As I have before said, there are but few hunters after office among them. How, then, can you say, as you do in your paper of August 25, that Roman Catholics are interested in an organization having for its object the distribution of the public treasure among them—“peaceably, if possible; *forcibly* if necessary?”

And again, you speak of your party's opposition to the “corrupting influences” of the Catholic Church. This is quite a serious charge. If the Catholic Church teaches corrupt practices to its members, or, what will amount to the same, influences them to be corrupt, this corruption must be apparent on the whole body of the Catholic people. You have had abundant opportunities to test the truth of this charge, in reference to those Roman Catholics whom you have personally known. Now, Mr. PRENTICE, tell us frankly the nature of this corruption, and all about it. Is it in the moral order? If so, give us the instances. Let us know the nature and quality of those crimes which the Roman Catholic Church teaches to its members. What practical Catholic, or regular communicant of that Church, can you show to be dishonest, untruthful, uncharitable, aggressive, or who, in a word, spurns the commandments of God, and refuses obedience to the laws of the land? How much more, as compared with others, have *you* lost through the dishonesty of your Roman Catholic subscribers to the Journal? Is this corruption in the social order? If so, it will be easy for you to point it out. Are Roman Catholics socially hard-hearted and aggressive? Have you ever known one that refused to keep faith with a Protestant? Are they politically corrupt? When were they so? Have Roman Catholic judges been corrupt in their decisions? Have Roman Catholics refused to pay their taxes, or to march in defense of their country when called on?

I had always been under the impression, that the Roman

Catholic Church taught obedience to the commandments of God; that it inculcated the virtues of charity and forgiveness of injuries; abnegation of self, and love of the neighbor; purity in thought and action; justice and obedience to law; truthfulness, honesty and sobriety. Will you say that these are corrupt teachings; I cannot think that you are prepared to say so.

In conclusion, dear sir, permit me to record the hope which I entertain, that you will cease this most unjust, illiberal and wicked warfare upon the Catholics of this country, because they happen to prefer their own way of worshiping God.

Unless you can prove your charges of "political aggression" and "corrupt practices," it is but sheer folly for you to undertake to give any other reasons, in justification of your conduct. There are certainly no motives of public policy requiring such a course at your hands. On the contrary, the peace of society, and the very existence of all those social and kindly feelings which go so far to make life a blessing, are placed in jeopardy by these constant efforts to render a well-meaning religious body suspected and hated by their Protestant fellow-citizens.

If your object be to enlist the sympathies of the bigoted portion of the community in order to pecuniary profit, by securing their patronage, then do I much fear that there is very little of hope of your ever again becoming the exponent of a conservative, wise, and consistent policy. But if, on the contrary, you have been led into your present position of open and virulent warfare upon your former friends and neighbors of the Catholic Church, by the excitement of a political contest in which the Catholics were opposed to you, causing you, in the heat of party strife, to forget the charities of life, and to be blinded to the teachings of the constitution, then I, and many others of your old friends, may confidently hope that with the return of your right reason, will also return the consciousness of the wrongs which you have inflicted on the Catholic body, and a consequent cessation of those uncharitable and unprovoked attacks of which the *Louisville Journal* has lately become the vehicle.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, August 29, 1855.

From the Louisville Daily Courier of September 2d, 1855.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I find the following paragraph in the Louisville Journal of yesterday:

"To all whom it may concern we have to say that we do not feel under the slightest obligation to respond to questions put to us by anonymous writers. Let every man who wishes us to talk to him show his face—if he has one fit to show."

It may possibly be that some one other than your correspondent has been propounding questions to Mr. GEO. D. PRENTICE, and that I may be altogether wrong in supposing, as intended for myself, the above very pleasant and amiable reminder of the editor's non-obligations. I am more inclined to believe this, as it so happens that the editor himself shortly after the appearance of the first article in the Courier over the signature of "A Kentucky Catholic," did directly question me as to its authorship, and was as directly answered upon that point. It is possible, however, that Mr. PRENTICE not only requires a knowledge of the identity of his interrogator for himself, but argues also that it is requisite, in order to remove the non-obligation on his part to answer troublesome questions, that the said interrogator shall *show his face* to the entire newspaper reading population of Louisville. Now I respectfully submit to the distinguished editor, that there may be other reasons than the one he indicates, why I should prefer, so far as the general public is concerned, to remain *incognito*. It should be sufficient for the editor that the face of the Courier's correspondent is known to him, and has been at any time for nearly twenty-four years. There will be ample time to call for the verdict of the public, when Mr. PRENTICE shall have charged that your correspondent's *face* is not *fit* to be shown.

It is a matter of doubt, however, with me, whether an editor is morally justifiable in refusing to answer questions of general interest to the community, when submitted in respectful language, on the plea that they are anonymously propounded. A conscientious editor will always weigh well the circumstances which may or may not render the solution of the interrogatories interesting to the community, and act accordingly. I am, myself, fully convinced that there never was a question demanding the exercise of more serious study and thought on the part of every true lover of his country, than the religious one which has unfortunately been foisted into

the political arena by, as I think, the designing demagogues of party. The question should be—are the Roman Catholics of this country, including bishops, priests, and laymen, chargeable with the crime of treason? This charge has been implied in a hundred different ways by the editor of the *Louisville Journal*. If the editor is right, and can prove himself so, he has nothing to fear from public opinion, and will deserve the lasting gratitude of all true Americans. If he is wrong, he should be thankful for the information that will set him aright, even though it come to him through the medium of an anonymous letter, or be directly referable to the *viva voce* exposition of his own Irish Roman Catholic kitchen-maid, however unfit her face may be to appear in the circles of polite society.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

LETTER SECOND.

SIR:—I have read with no little surprise your article of September 5th, the purport of which, you kindly say, was suggested to you by the letter of a “Kentucky Catholic.” I have great objection to using what may be construed into disrespectful language in reference to anything emanating from the editor of the *Louisville Journal*, but a proper regard for truth will not permit me to give any other name to the entirety of your three column article than absolute nonsense. It is *Sam Slick*, I believe, who tells of a certain versatile author, that whenever he wished to write a book, he was in the habit of *reading up for his subject*, and however ignorant he might be of the particular topic of which he wished to treat, by dint of patching and piecing—stealing a scrap here and a scrap there—he was enabled to concoct a very creditable production. Now, it appears to me that you, Mr. PRENTICE, have, for awhile past, been *reading up for your subject of Popery*, and one of the greatest faults I find with your performance, arises from the fact, that you have been very unfortunate in your selection of authors. “Dowling on Romanism,” “Danger in the Dark,” and such like books, are scarcely of that kind which a veritable historian would choose for authorities. I had certainly a right to expect, in

case you did me the honor to notice my communication at all, something like a candid answer to the queries therein propounded. It seems, however, that though you are peculiarly happy in making sweeping allegations, you have not the faculty of individualizing. You had directly charged the papal hierarchy with being "political aggressors." The charge being unlimited, included, per consequence, each and every member of that body, at home and abroad. It had reference as well to your "friend," Bishop SPALDING, as to Archbishop HUGHES—to the Kentucky Bishops of Nashville and Richmond, as well as to the French Bishop of Vincennes, and the Irish Archbishop of Cincinnati.

The question being as to whether the papal hierarchy is dangerous to our civil well-being as a nation and the perpetuity of our form of government, it was but natural to suppose that you were prepared to prove the truth of your allegation from the well known acts and acknowledged opinions of at least some one member of the hierarchy whom you had personally known. It will not do for you to say, that you eschew personalities, while you charge a whole community with being influenced by treasonable intentions.

But you "have forborne to say much that might have been said about the individual acts of *alien* Prelates, resident among us, having a bearing upon the institutions of this country." These "individual acts" are precisely what I wish to get at. I will engage, though a simple layman, to give you absolution for all the additional sin you may incur on account of changing your allegation of political aggression from the whole body of the hierarchy to a few individual Bishops. First, however, permit me to set you right on one point. There are no *alien* Bishops in the United States. One-third of the American Bishops are native-born, and all of the foreign-born Bishops have taken the oath of allegiance. They all consequently stand under the constitution, precisely as do GEORGE D. PRENTICE and CALEB W. LOGAN—*free American citizens*. This being settled, I ask you to point out the acts of those American Bishops which you speak of as "bearing on the institutions of this country." I have denied that the American Bishops are justly chargeable with being political aggressors, and whenever the contrary allegation is made in such a shape as to be tangible, I hold myself ready to disprove it.

Inasmuch as your article can, in no sense, be construed into

an answer to the queries put to you through the columns of the *Courier*, it will be scarcely expected of me that I should wade through its interminable depths of twaddle and cant, of bigotry and folly, for the purpose of answering the baseless charges which you bring against the Catholic Church. Indeed, it is hardly the province of a layman to engage in the defense of the dogmas and practices of the Church, while there are so many good and reliable divines, who are both able and willing to give the sincere inquirer every information. Neither do I believe that the columns of a political paper are the most appropriate medium for disquisitions on theological subjects. Hence, in all that I have heretofore said, I have strictly confined myself to the religious-political question, which not I nor my brethren in the Church are responsible for having brought into the arena of party politics. Upon those men who have mooted this question, now so clearly unwise that it is being dropped as a dead weight upon the party in many of the States where it had taken strong foothold, will rest the whole ignominy of its conception. The constitution having guaranteed to every man, whether Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Catholic, certain inalienable and indefeasible rights respecting the free exercise of his religion, those who would wantonly introduce into the political contests of the country, test qualifications on account of religious preferences, are, in my opinion, guilty of a crime not far removed from treason.

I will, nevertheless, endeavor to point out a few of the absurdities, not to use a stronger term, into which you have fallen.

1st. You say that the Catholic system is peculiarly "uncongenial to our political latitude." So far is this from being the case, that it has been conceded by many of our wisest political men—Protestants mind you—that the members of the Roman Catholic Church, ever since the formation of the government, have not only professed a love for the institutions of the country, but have shown by their acts an earnest desire for their perpetuity. They are exempt from the taint of Abolitionism in the North, and of nullification in the South.

2d. You ignorantly charge the Catholic laity of this country with being priest-ridden. Now I will venture to assert that there is not a single Protestant sect in the whole country, against whom the same charge may not be made, with a much greater regard for truth.

3d. All that you say on the subject of Roman Catholic

Church government, is applicable to the Protestant Episcopal and Methodist Churches, and in some degree to the Presbyterian and other forms of Protestant Church discipline.

4th. You write as if you thought the Christian religion was so Protean-like in its character as to be made adaptable, *by changes within itself*, for every peculiar form of civil government. The idea is most absurd. Christ being God, could not have possibly founded an imperfect Church. And the Church, if it be a true one, cannot possibly change its character. Your idea that the Christian Churches of the United States should copy their formula of government from that of the country, argues, to say the least, a direct squinting on your part towards the annexation of Church and State. But I allege that Christianity, as taught by the Catholic Church, both as to its dogmas and its discipline, is not unsuited to any form of civil government, and from the simple reason given by the Saviour for the guidance of the Church, "My kingdom is not of this world."

5th. Your idea that "all Christian graces flow from the Pope downward to the people," is of itself so sublimely absurd that it requires no remark from me.

6th. You say that "they (the hierarchy) swear to persecute and wage war with heretics," &c. This charge is entirely gratuitous, and has not a particle of foundation in fact. You garble and pervert the reading of the old oath at one time taken by the Bishops of the Catholic Church. The promise made by the Bishop at his consecration, that he will oppose the spread of error, is made by you to read that he will physically exterminate the promoters of error. No such meaning can be attached to it. The Catholic Bishop promises at his consecration, according to the command of Him who sent his apostles to teach all nations, that, in his teaching, truth shall be his guide, and as a necessary consequence, he is bound to oppose, not by physical force, but by argument and the simple power of truth, that which is false. The position which the Catholic Bishop here holds is plainly incontrovertible, and is in some degree binding on the consciences of all Christians, without the formula of an oath. But the extracts which you give, with the exception of the one with reference to "the possessions of the Bishop's table," are not found in the oath now taken at the consecration of the Bishops of the United States and several other countries. There have been men before our day who "sought excuses for malice," by perverting the obvious meaning of words ;

and in order to remove as far as possible any pretext for such perversion, the wording of the oath was changed over sixty years ago.

7th. You say that "they (the hierarchy) solemnly swear not to sell, nor give away, nor otherwise alienate, without consent of the Roman Pontiff, the possessions of their table," and, strangely enough, you argue from this, that Archbishop HUGHES was influenced by this clause in his opposition to the change brought about by the action of the New York Legislature, in reference to the tenure of church property. This section of the oath has nothing to do with church property. It was intended, by its insertion into the formula of the oath, to prevent any abuse which might arise on account of the improper alienation of benefices set apart for the personal support of the Bishops, and of which they only had the use during the terms of their administration. What wrong is done to the Catholic people, or to the government of this country, by this clause of the oath? The President of the United States has the use of the White House during the term of his office, but he certainly would not be allowed to sell or alienate it.

8th. You speak of the hierarchy tyrannizing over the consciences of men. What is tyranny? It is the *forcible* requirement of an homage neither required by the laws of God nor man. In speaking of human law, I, of course, mean law founded on justice. No Roman Catholic is thus constrained. When I voluntarily conform to certain practices prescribed by the Church, I do not recognize that she tyrannizes over me. When my judgment has taught me that religious truth is only to be found in the Catholic Church, there is no more servitude in my obeying her recognized laws than there is in the Protestant's voluntary homage to the truths of revelation. Man naturally feels himself ennobled while he pays homage to the truth. The Bishops are represented as self-constituted tyrants, and the laity as abject slaves. Now, the plain fact is, that the self-same law of obedience to the discipline of the Church, is as obligatory on Pius IX as it is on the humble Indian Neophyte of Kansas. The duty of sacramental confession, for instance, governs the one precisely as it does the other. The duty of teaching the true Catholic doctrines—those which have always been taught and received—is of as binding obligation on the consciences of the Prelates of the Church, as is the duty of *hearing* and being taught these same doctrines on those of the humblest members of the household of faith.

The Roman Catholic layman reads in the sacred volume, *Hear the Church*, and he esteems it a privilege to do so. *Hear the Church*, says the inspired Word—and Priest, and Bishop, and Cardinal, and Pope, bow in like humble reverence and obedience to the divine command.

9th. I observe, not only in your article of Wednesday, but in many others with which you have lately afflicted the truth no less than the unbigoted portion of the community, a something for which I can find no other name than an *intense selfishness of Americanism*, most inconsistent with the generally received idea of Christian charity. To be an American is a very good thing, and so I esteem it; but it does not necessarily carry with it a hatred of all that is not American. Christ did not die alone for Americans. He commands us to love our neighbor *as ourselves*, and he has given us a rule in the case of the “man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves,” whereby we may distinguish who is our neighbor. Your pharisaical cant, judged by this rule, about the ignominy of Roman Catholics “being ruled by a hierarchy of foreign lords,” is in exceeding bad taste.

10th. “A Kentucky Catholic” does “acknowledge that the constitution of Kentucky utters the truth touching the *natural and indefeasable* rights of mankind.” But he does not acknowledge that the head of his Church is unceasingly invading these natural and indefeasible rights. Almighty God has given free will to man. He has placed fire and water before him, and bade him stretch out his hand and take which he will. But he has also commanded him in the new revelation, under penalty of eternal reprobation, *to believe and be baptized*. You may as well then say that the Bible is unceasingly invading the natural and indefeasible rights which the constitution of Kentucky allows to the infidel and unbeliever. The obedience which the Roman Catholic pays to the Pope is as much voluntary as is the obedience which each and every Protestant pays to the discipline of his church; nor is it one whit more dangerous to our free institutions.

11th. You speak of Roman Catholics acknowledging the temporal power of the Pope. Now, I defy you, sir, to point out one single Roman Catholic Priest or Bishop in the United States, that acknowledges this temporal power in the head of the Church. The late Councils of Bishops in Baltimore and in Cincinnati, publicly repudiated this charge.

12th. You make a comparison between Protestant and

Catholic countries very unfavorable to the latter. In this connection, however, you strangely enough forget to mention that the only two countries of Christendom which do, at this day, systematically persecute on account of religious faith, are the Protestant countries of Sweden and Prussia. In Italy and Spain there are no Protestants to persecute. In Catholic Belgium, equal in every respect to Protestant Holland, while the Catholics number 4,000,000, there are only 8,000 Protestants, and yet these Catholics voluntarily chose a Protestant king, and the government fully recognizes a free press and free worship. The Protestants of Catholic Austria are at this day, more free, in some respects, than are the Roman Catholics of the United States. They have their separate free schools voluntarily accorded to them. I would like to follow you in this comparison of Protestant and Catholic countries, and may do so hereafter, but this article is now longer than I had intended it should be, and I must bring it to a close. I will say, however, before concluding, that, being of a very hopeful temperament, and knowing that you have capacity to learn, and that by some extraordinary grace you may be brought to repentance, if the time should ever come that you will ask for admission into the Catholic Church, I hereby voluntarily offer you my services as *sponsor* on that interesting occasion.

Yours, very truly,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, September 8, 1855.

LETTER THIRD.

SIR:—I am forced to enter my protest against your manner of conducting this controversy. The side issues which you are constantly bringing up and reiterating with an energy which might, under other circumstances, gain for you the reputation of the *Bombastes* of anti-Catholic crusade polemics, have nothing to do with the matter in question. I asked of you to point out the political aggressions with which you had charged the American Catholic hierarchy; and you answer that "some of them are Jesuits, and all are jesuitical." I asked you to name a single Roman Catholic Bishop or priest outside of the States of the Church, who will acknow-

ledge that he owes civil allegiance to the Pope; and you answer that "Pope Gregory the VII, (he lived eight hundred years ago,) commanded that all the princes of the earth should kiss his feet." I should like to see that bull of Pope Gregory. I fear me much you have been imposed upon in this matter. Your quotations from Archbishop HUGHES, and from Bishops FLAGET and ENGLAND are vague, evidently garbled, and, taken out of the connection in which they were originally placed, even meaningless. In order to give the readers of the *Courier* the benefit of your labors, in proof of the charges you had brought against the hierarchy, I append these extracts:

Bishop ENGLAND once wrote to his Irish friends a letter of palpable hostility to the religious liberty of America. Says he: "The *people here* claim and endeavor to assume the same power which the clauses and conditions would give to the *crown* amongst you, though not to the same extent. The consequence is that religion is neglected, degraded, despised, and insulted with impunity."

And "My Lord Bishop FLAGET," late of Bardstown, Kentucky, in speaking by letter to his foreign patrons of the difficulties encountered by Catholic missionaries in converting the Indians, refers to "their continual traffics among the whites, which (says he) cannot be hindered as long as the *republican government* shall subsist."

And the Most Reverend Irish Archbishop HUGHES, of New York, says: "That unfortunately the moral attributes of *our* progressive greatness are in the estimation of the civilized nations of the world sinking from day to day." — *Louisville Journal*, Sept. 12th, 1855.

We have here a truly astounding array of political aggressions! But how am I to know if these quotations be correctly rendered? You give no date for them, nor the titles of the books, or official papers, from which they are taken. You leave out the connection in which they were written, and thus possibly distort a meaning from the unconnected sentences, not recognized by the authors. However, let us take them up, count by count, and see how far they are irresistible.

First, as to Bishop ENGLAND, we all know that he was a man of sense, and incapable of writing anything particularly absurd. It is therefore highly improbable that he should have written so entirely meaningless a paragraph as that which you ascribe to him. Besides, he was a pure patriot, and as can be proved from a volume of evidence, strongly attached to our republican institutions.

And the saintly Bishop FLAGET—the noble old man whose voice even now rings in my ears, and brings tears to my eyes—he, too, according to the editor of the *Journal*, was opposed to our liberties! It was left for you, sir, to discern that which was kept secret from his spiritual children

during more than the lifetime of a generation, and which, if true, would give the lie to a thousand patriotic sentiments which he has been heard to utter. Have we not here a striking exemplification of old Esop's fable of the dead lion and the living ass? It seems that Bishop FLAGET did, at one time, complain of the American government's permitting the free traffic in spirits with the poor Indians. He found, doubtless, as many another missionary has found, that it was useless to labor for the reclaiming of his red children, so long as this traffic was permitted. It will be remembered that Bishop FLAGET was a refugee from the persecutions of the French revolution. About the year 1792, we find him laboring as a missionary among the French at Vincennes and the neighboring tribes of Indians. The local and military officials of the United States, about that time and till after the war of 1812, were indebted to Bishop FLAGET for invaluable assistance, afterwards gratefully acknowledged, in several of the treaties made with the Indians. Doubtless the letter, from which you profess to extract, was written in French, and afterwards translated into English. Under such circumstances, it is very clearly perceptible that the passage could easily have been, and most likely was, mistranslated and corrupted. Of one thing you may be perfectly assured, there never was a more earnest and sincere advocate of our constitutional liberties on the soil of the Union than was Bishop FLAGET.

The extract which you give from Archbishop HUGHES has no more force to indicate his opposition to our peculiar institutions, than it has to prove his adherence to the mysteries of Buddhism. I could point out to you many an old-line Whig who has for years battled at your side for what he and you then conceived to be the true conservative policy, that will agree with the Archbishop in his sentiment of regret that the "moral attributes of our progressive greatness are, in the estimation of the civilized world, sinking from day to day."

The sentiment of the paragraph which you give from the "Rambler," in reference to religious liberty, taken in the sense in which the phrase is generally understood, is false; but if taken in the sense intended by the author, it is incontrovertibly true. The editor was evidently not speaking of that religious liberty which consists in one's being free to profess any mode of worship independent of civil restraint. He was speaking of that liberty of the individual mind to form a faith for itself, or to discard all faith, and which argues

complete unaccountability to God therefor, because of the liberty of will with which He has invested it. The same may be said with regard to the "intolerance of Catholicism." If taken in the sense which you evidently intend that your readers shall draw from it, it is false. Neither does the editor of the "Rambler," or any other Roman Catholic, believe it. But if taken in the sense intended by the author, and which any logical mind will be able to draw from it, it is true. Truth cannot be otherwise than intolerant of that quality which is opposed to it. If, for instance, I should hold, as incontestably true, that the writer of the article in the *Journal* is a lunatic on the subject of Popery, there would be no room in my mind for the tolerance of an opposite opinion. The Catholic Church is at once tolerant and intolerant. She is intolerant—not indeed of the impugnors of her truth; not of their social position and civil well-being; not of their liberties, civil or religious; but she is intolerant of those errors which they hold, and which are directly opposed to her ever-abiding truth. She is tolerant because she holds the truth; and truth is rooted in *love*. A Catholic cannot possibly entertain hatred against his erring brother. The man must still claim his love, though he may not tolerate his error.

Again, with regard to the bishop's oath, you say, "It is utterly false that the language, or the sense of the oath, only binds bishops to oppose the spread of error." Now, I again say, that the whole tenor and scope of this part of the oath has for its object this and this only. The sense which you give to the wording of the oath is not the Catholic sense. It is one which you, and other enemies of the church before you, have manufactured to suit your purposes. So learned a theological amateur as you have proved yourself to be, should know that the Catholic Church claims to be "immutable" only in doctrine, and that a change in the wording of the bishop's oath could be easily accomplished without damage to her immutability. I expressly stated that the old oath contained nothing which could in any way compromise the civil allegiance of the bishops. My defense was of that oath entirely, notwithstanding that the passages, which you object to, have been stricken out of the oath as now taken by the American bishops. You speak of this oath in connection with Archbishop PURCELL. Now, I respectfully propose that you publish the Archbishop's defense of the oath in the *Journal*, and I will willingly take the verdict of your readers

as to its containing obligations at variance with the duty of civil allegiance.

Your ideas seem to be extremely vague and uncertain on the point of man's *inalienable* and *indefeasible* rights. What is religious liberty, in the sense in which it is implied in the constitution of the United States? It is the right to believe and worship according to conscience, unrestrained by pains and penalties from the civil government. The constitution entirely ignores the question of the *moral* right of every one to believe as he pleases. It leaves this where it should be left, between man and his God. Man is accountable to God for his belief and worship, and not to the government. If I hold that the Catholic Church is the organ of God's communication with the world, I hold that which she teaches as the doctrine and command of God, just as the Protestant holds that to be the will of God, which is held and taught by his particular church. There is, however, this difference. While I hold that the medium of my faith is stamped with a divine authority, the Protestant acknowledges that the authority by which he holds any particular form of faith and worship is merely human. It were very easy here to go into the question of private interpretation of the scriptures, and to show that, though both Protestants and Catholics believe the Bible to be the word of God, yet the numberless systems of belief and worship professedly taken from it, on the plea of the right of private judgment, being only the private opinions of the individual readers, can have no claim to be called divine.

You inquire how comes it that the greater portion of the Catholic clergy and people of this country are foreigners? This wonderful quandary is of so easy solution that I am only surprised that any man of sense should have entertained it. With the exception of that of Maryland, all the old colonies of this country were made up of immigrants from Protestant States, who were consequently Protestants, as are their descendants to this day. The Catholic population has been greatly increased of late years by immigration; in such a ratio, indeed, as to naturally require a proportionate number of foreign clergymen. As this decreases, so will the relative proportion of native and foreign pastors. It is, and always has been, one of the first objects of the hierarchy of the United States to rear up a body of native priests. This is the universal practice of the Church in all countries. In Maryland and Kentucky, the greater number of ordinations have been of natives. Even of the foreign-born Bishops, most of them,

previous to consecration, had been residents of the country from twenty to forty years, and there are few that did not receive their clerical training in the United States. You say that, "the hierarchy of the United States have a policy of their own touching the institutions" of this country. To be sure they have. But this policy is also the policy of every true patriot and lover of his country, Protestant and Catholic. The happy possessor of the virtues of honesty and truthfulness, may and does hold them as *his own*, but he does not feel himself at all the poorer when he sees the familiar faces of his own virtues held in like durance by his mortal brother.

You refer to the encyclical letter of Pope Gregory the XVI, in terms not warranted by the tenor of that much abused document. During the term of his Pontificate, France, a portion of Italy, and several of the neighboring states, were flooded with a multiplicity of immoral and infidel books. The Pope was appealed to by the Bishops whose flocks were being contaminated by these trashy and vile publications. The encyclical denounces "that *indifferentism* which is falsely called liberty," and strongly censures "the licentiousness of *booksellers* (not of the *press* as you have it,) which induces them to publish all kinds of infidel and immoral books." The Pope illustrates his meaning by saying: "What man of sense will say that we shall allow poisons to be freely used, to be sold, and transported from place to place, to be drunk even, on the ground that there is an antidote capable of saving life if duly taken."

I have before stated that in Rome and Italy there are no resident Protestants. The whole population being Catholic, there were no motives of justice to induce Pope Pius IX, after his return from exile, to change the ancient law of the government in the matter of the religion of the State. The Protestant stranger in Rome is entirely unmolested in the exercise of his religion. Both English and American Protestants have their separate places of worship, under the protection of the government, and I will venture to say that the Catholic citizens of Rome have never, in a single instance, stoned these edifices, or insulted the worshipers. Can you say as much in reference to the *resident* Catholics and their churches in this free and enlightened country?

You speak of the hierarchy being a "close corporation," and of their ignoring the "rights of the laity." Will you be kind enough to tell me in how far the laity of the Methodist Episcopal Church are allowed to partake in its govern-

mental administration? It seems to be very difficult to make you understand that the laws of the Catholic Church are of no more binding force upon the layman than they are on the priest and the Bishop. There are duties, to be sure, peculiarly appertaining to each person, according to his state of life, and every one is responsible to God for the faithful discharge of these duties. The advocate may not, without sin, engage in the prosecution of an unjust suit. The physician may not wantonly endanger life by experimenting on the constitution of his patient. The editor may not impugn the known truth, or endeavor to foist upon any party, or body of men, principles which they solemnly repudiate. The priest may not fail to give good example, and to spend his life if necessary for the well-being of those committed to his charge. The Bishop must guard with watchful care the whole flock; he must "reprove, admonish, and advise" in season, and so let his light shine, that the people may glorify God for His good gifts. The constitution of the Church was not intended alone for any particular form of civil government, but for all. It was framed so as to suit the exigencies of all times, of all peoples, and of all tongues. That man must be blind indeed who fails to discern the wisdom and beauty inherent in the Church. Without her headship in the Pope, there could be no unity, and your desire for national churches might be gratified—at the expense of Christianity itself.

You tell us that Luther gave to the laity their just rights. If you mean by this that Luther emancipated the people from the servitude of tyrants, you have read history to very little purpose. Wherever Lutheranism exists as the dominant religion of any country, there you will find a union of church and state, the press enslaved, and to a considerable extent actual persecution of non-conformists. I refer you to Prussia, Denmark, and Sweden. On the contrary, it is perfectly demonstrable, that in all Catholic countries, where there is any considerable minority of Protestants, there you will find free worship, a free press, and Protestants having access to the highest offices. I refer you for this to France, Austria, Bavaria, Hungary, and Belgium.

A word with regard to what you say of the great Pope Gregory VII. Much has been ignorantly written and spoken of this Pope. But Protestant historians have appreciated the glory of his character. They acknowledge that he was equal to the task which Providence had placed before him; that he

"saved Europe from barbarism," and what is more beautiful still, that "he illustrated Christianity by his virtues." The last words on his lips were: "And I, too, have loved justice and hated iniquity, and I die in exile." The German Protestant historian, M. Voigt, says of him: "It is difficult to bestow upon him exaggerated eulogy; for he has laid everywhere the foundation of a solid glory. But every one should endeavor to render justice to whom justice is due; let no one cast a stone at one so innocent; let every one respect and honor a man who has labored for his age, with views so grand and so generous. Let him who is conscious of having calumniated him, re-enter into his own conscience."

You speak of "Catholic monasteries and other penitentiaries, in which voluntary convicts are confined and tortured." This whole sentence is replete with contradictions and absurdities. It is a principle of common law, that every man shall be allowed to follow that avocation, or manner of life, which best suits him, care being taken that he shall not therein interfere with the rights and privileges of others. Now I take it, if I choose to enter into a monastery, I seek my individual happiness in doing so; and no man of moderate capacity, however he may wonder at my mode of seeking happiness, can aver that in following the bent of my inclinations I have not acted precisely as he would, were our positions reversed. Voluntary convicts, indeed! Let me tell you, sir, that some of the happiest people in the state of Kentucky are occupants of these same *penitentiaries*, as you sneeringly call them. They earn by the labor of their hands that which they eat and wear, and they have withal something for the poor and the stranger, in addition to prayers from clean hearts. Wherein are you better off? But the monks of La Trappe actually "shave their heads, and bury their dead with their faces downward." This, I suppose, you will call rank *political aggression*! Well, if I must accede something to you, I suppose this item of Trappist treason will suit as well as anything else.

You are extremely fond of using such phrases as "drunk with the blood of the saints," "a despotic altar," "our lord, the Pope," "the hierarchy claim to have an exclusive monopoly of grace and truth," &c., &c. Now all this I may very justly call *cant*. It is not intended for men of judgment, but for "the groundlings." When I read it, I cannot help imagining that I see before me an ignorant popery-mad buffoon, or a tattered martyrdom-hunting street lecturer.

Rid yourself, my dear sir, of all such superfluous habiliments. Your editorial figure is not overly prepossessing at best. Why add to the blunders incidental to an ill-regulated education these shapeless rags of bigotry?

In the opening paragraph of your article of Wednesday last, you seem to imply that you have a doubt about my being either a Kentuckian or a layman. Indeed, it has been intimated to me as a somewhat general opinion among those of your no-popery party who have taken the trouble to think of the matter at all—it is a lamentable fact that few of them are much overgiven to thinking upon any subject—that the correspondent of the *Courier* is none other than a certain dignitary of the Catholic Church, who is therein seeking to hide his individual responsibility under the cover of a very contemptible device. Now I wish it distinctly understood, that the writer of the articles signed “A Kentucky Catholic,” is both a Kentuckian and a Roman Catholic layman; and that, having himself written every line and syllable in each and every one of the aforesaid articles, and that too, without the assistance or dictation of any other, clergyman or layman, he has no intention of allowing any one to assume his responsibilities, or to be held publicly or privately responsible for the statements, language, tone, and temper of said articles. If they contain errors of induction or fact, he alone is responsible for them. Should there be any one sufficiently curious to wish to know the real name of “A Kentucky Catholic,” let him apply to the editors of the *Courier*, who are hereby authorized to give the desired information.

In conclusion, allow me to repeat the questions previously asked, and which, up to this time, you have completely ignored:

When were the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, or any one of them, guilty of *political aggression*?

Can you point out a single Roman Catholic Bishop or priest in the United States who does acknowledge, or who has acknowledged, that he owes civil allegiance to the Pope?

What are the corrupt practices inculcated by the Catholic Church?

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, Sept. 18th, 1855.

LETTER FOURTH.

"Words, words, words filled with
Sound and fury, signifying nothing."

SIR: I have never been more impressed with the aptitude of the above trite quotation, than in reading your reply to my last letter as it appears in your Journal of the 22d inst. I have looked in vain through the closely printed columns for an answer to my inquiries regarding the "aggressions of the Papal hierarchy" of the United States, the "corrupting influences of the Catholic church," and the acknowledgment of civil fealty on the part of the American Bishops to the Pope of Rome.

My dissatisfaction as to your manner of conducting what you call the "Papal controversy," was the natural result of your *not sticking to the point*. A logical reasoner, in laying down a proposition, does not leave it till he has proved both his premises and their consequences. You laid down the proposition that the hierarchy of the United States hold civil allegiance to a foreign potentate. The Bishops themselves solemnly deny it, and you have the effrontery to say, that you, *par excellence*, know more about what the Bishops believe than they do themselves.

I am not at all disposed to follow you in your efforts to escape from the main issue. Stick to your text. Give us the instances of political aggression which you have charged on the Bishops. Designate the kind and quality of those crimes which the Catholic Church inculcates on her members. Give us the name of one single individual of the American hierarchy who does acknowledge, or who has acknowledged, that he owes civil allegiance to the Pope. To all your charges against the church, "cut and dried" for the use of the anti-Popery lecturers, and unsubstantiated by a particle of evidence, or even of reference, I answer, *nego totum* — I deny the whole. To use your own language, if you "wish to talk to me" about side issues, having nothing to do with the matters in controversy, you must "show me the face" of your authority. I ask for the page and author, chapter and verse, and until these are given, I do not hold that I am "under any obligation" to do more than throw in your teeth that clincher to all argument based on unsubstantiated assertion — *NEGO TOTUM*!

You say that you have not enlarged on the private opinions of men, and yet the private opinions of men are made the

basis of almost every charge you bring against the Church. If you really wish to understand what is Catholic doctrine, get the Catechism of the Council of Trent and read it. What if it be true that in past ages there have been found some Catholic theologians who did favor a course which would, in our day, be designated a persecuting one. Did not Calvin favor a similar course, and carry it out to the letter, when he had Servetus burnt at the stake? Did not the head of English Protestantism, who murdered wives with as little remorse as he would have strangled kittens, also murder, embowel, and burn Catholics, precisely because they were Catholics? Did not the reformers of Germany not only persecute Catholics, but pursue a similar course towards their Protestant non-conformist brethren? Where will you find a better example of persecution for conscience sake than was exhibited in the religious warfare between the Covenanters of Scotland and their Protestant brethren of the English Church? How was Protestantism itself propagated in England and Germany? Not certainly by persevering argument and the simple power of truth. Stronger arguments than these were necessary to pervert whole nations from their ancient faith. The "arm of the flesh" was invoked, and the power of the *civil magistracy*; and those who refused to turn traitors to their God were either slaughtered or transported from the land. Did you ever happen to hear of the dispersion of the Catholic Acadians from their homes in Canada by the Protestant Government of England in the last century? There are men even now living who were born before this act of wholesale persecution was perpetrated. And if we come to our own country, who have been the persecutors here? Assuredly not the Roman Catholics. They have not burnt witches, or hung Quakers. They have not enacted "blue laws" for the punishment of non-conformists. On the contrary, when the unfortunate object of Protestant persecution knocked at their doors, in obedience to the divine command, they took the stranger to their bosoms and administered to his wants. And even now, now in our own day, in the full blaze of the advanced civilization of the nineteenth century, in our own land, too, whose freedom and consequent greatness is attributable alike to the patriotism of our common ancestry, Protestant and Catholic, assisted by the blood and treasure of a Catholic ally, who is it that is endeavoring to rear the standard of persecution, and destroy the liberty and privileges of one portion of the citizens of the Union? Is this the work of Roman Catholics? You

know that it is not. I will not even insult the sense of my separated brethren by calling it a Protestant work, except so far as Protestants, as such, have been inveigled into assisting in the selfish schemes of a set of miserable demagogues, nominally Protestant and scarcely Christian. It is you, sir, and such as you, who are laboring for this end. It is you, sir, and such as you, who, with canting hypocrisy, are sounding the alarm of danger to the republic, because Roman Catholics are here allowed, alike with the Protestant and the Jew, and under the shield of the constitutional compact, *freely to live and freely to worship!*

It is useless for me to endeavor to set you right, while you are pre-determined to hold on to your errors. The man who willfully misrepresents the meaning of another is guilty of a species of fraud, which, in my Catholic simplicity, looks very like forgery. You thus misrepresent the whole context of my remarks upon the passage from the "Rambler." And if you will so misrepresent my explanation of that passage, what am I to expect better from you when you profess to extract from Roman Catholic theological works? But not only are you guilty of fraud in reference to this, but you actually endeavor to palm off another fraud on your own readers. The extract given in your former article was scarcely six lines in length, and embodied two simple propositions, which I endeavored to explain, and which, I have had the assurance of sound Protestant reasoners, I did satisfactorily explain. Your present extract is more than three times as long, and contains other and different propositions. Yet you labor to make your readers believe that I had acknowledged the propositions of this last extract as "incontestably true." Is not this a fraud? Again, though I did acknowledge the correctness of the two propositions of your first extract, when taken in the sense endeavored to be conveyed by the editor of the "Rambler," and which sense I clearly explained, yet I acknowledged the same propositions to be *false* when taken in a different sense. You clearly endeavor to make your readers believe that I acknowledged as true that which I did pronounce false. But this fraud of yours may be of service, in teaching honest men to place very little reliance on the candor of anti-Popery writers, and also in the reliability of their quotations.

Your citation concerning the books of the *Index*, exhibits the fact that your want of candor is only equaled by your ignorance of your subject. The Holy Scriptures are held in fully

as much reverence by Catholics as they are by Protestants, and even in greater reverence, for they deem them so sacred, as to be very cautious how they *wrest* them "to their own destruction." The Bible is found in almost every Catholic family, and is freely read, though not freely interpreted. Since the year 1800, four Catholic booksellers in Ireland, have issued nearly 300,000 copies of the Bible. In the United States there have been many editions printed, and copies are of easy access to every one.

The laws of the Catholic Church are intended for the guidance of her own children. Those outside of the pale of her authority have nothing to do with them. So long, therefore, as her laws do not interfere with the natural or vested rights of those outside, and they never can so interfere with them, I consider it a piece of unprovoked impertinence for you, or any other dissenter from her authority, to dictate changes in her discipline, and quarrel with her members because they choose to accept her discipline without change. Would you not think it strange of me, a Roman Catholic, if I were to suggest to the Synod of the Presbyterian Church sundry changes in her ritual, mode of worship, and manner of vesting church property? You would clearly consider me a madman were I to do so. And yet you, and the thousands like you, who have volunteered to reform the Catholic Church, are doing all this. You virtually say to the Catholic Church, you have no right to prevent your members from reading infidel and immoral books—this is a restriction of their indefeasible rights. * * You have no right to have a hierarchy at all; laymen can govern the church without such a system. * * * Your Bishops have no right to prefix a cross to their signatures; they should "affix their signatures, like the plain people of America." Reverse the case, and suppose it is the Methodist or Protestant Episcopal Church which is thus insolently spoken to by Roman Catholics, and what would be the answer? My Kentucky education would indicate the proper one at a moment's warning. It would be an indignant injunction for such impertinent meddlers to *mind their own business!* If such a declaration would be right from a Protestant to a Catholic, would it not be equally correct, under similar circumstances, from a Catholic to a Protestant? Unquestionably it would. We ask not for your sympathy on account of what you are pleased to call our *enslaved* condition. Our chains are self-imposed. They are light, and we bend not under them. They are magnetized,

as it were, by electric flashes from heaven itself, and they give us strength to "walk erect as in the day." We ask not for your advice as to how we shall worship. We have a better rule than you can give us. We ask you not to take charge of our ecclesiastical affairs and our church property. *Mind your own business!* This is the axiom of common sense—rough and unpolished, yet pure gold; American in its aptitude, and true as is the great American heart to its love of liberty. *Mind your own business, and let us alone!* We interfere not in the regulation of your systems of church government. We meddle not with your synods, nor your convocations, nor your general assemblies! *Let us alone!* and, at the same time, *let alone* the federal constitution by which our rights are guaranteed.

The contempt which you promise us unless we shall consent to receive your pity, is a very harmless article. We can manage to get along without feeling at all inconvenienced from it. We only ask you to be careful that the feeling does not breed in you a more aggressive kind of passion, which may impel you to take upon yourselves the prerogative of Almighty God, and punish by physical pains the objects of your contempt. The transition is singularly easy, and since the advent of Know-Nothingism, something more than indications of it have been abundant in the land.

You have much greater cause to fear on account of the possibility of such a result, than have the Roman Catholics; for though you may burn our churches, mangle and imprison our bodies, and fetter the freedom of our religious worship, you cannot put chains on the immortal soul. This will still be free, and from the very ashes of our bodies will spring the hosts to take our places. But you, who in the pride of your human wisdom thank God "that you are not like the rest of men," in doing these things, will be able to congratulate yourselves on having given the fatal blow to the freedom of our country, and at the same time to those qualities of its freedom in which you take most pride, its advancement in wealth and commercial prosperity.

Your reference to the act of the Continental Congress of 1774, is a very unfortunate one. This very act lost to us Canada, and the assistance of her people in our struggle for independence. For, when the delegation appointed to confer with the people of Canada in regard to the propriety of joining forces with us, and which delegation consisted of Rev John Carroll, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore, Chase

and Franklin, did urge this policy upon the Canadians, they justified their refusal by pointing to this very act. Charles Carroll, though the only Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence, represented the only Catholic colony then in the country, and jeopardized thereby more than any ten individuals that did sign that document.

If you suppose you have answered my queries, even to the satisfaction of any non-Catholic reasoner of moderate capacities, you were never more mistaken in your life. First, you reason from premises which are false, and which we do not acknowledge, and therefore your conclusions are likewise false. We hold no civil allegiance to a foreign potentate. Secondly, the Catholic people are before and all around you, and if they are more corrupt than others, it needs no reference from you to Catholic treatises on moral theology, printed in a dead language, and for the guidance of the priesthood, to prove them so. The fact will be self-evident, if your charge is true. That it is basely false, will be the judgment of every right-hearted man that has ever lived in a Catholic community. Thirdly, "aggressions" are always tangible. They can be seen and felt; and it will not do for you to reason from your abstract ideas of what you conceive the Church to be, of what ought to be her policy. You had charged the American Bishops with being political aggressors; and when asked for the proof, you throw yourself upon your reserved rights, and declare that men who hold to certain principles, which you manufacture out of whole cloth for them, if they are not aggressive, *ought to be so*.

The theological compartment of your brain is in a state of wretched confusion. Notwithstanding, you have endeavored to enlighten me, and the rest of mankind, on the subject of man's "inalienable and indefeasible rights," I cannot possibly get at your meaning, and am strongly impressed with the idea that you yourself do not precisely know what you believe on the subject. From your last explanation, I am led to the conclusion, that you believe that man has an indefeasible right to refuse to obey the command of God. Is this so?

There is one fact connected with the Know-Nothing crusade against the Catholic Church, which is certainly worthy of the attention of every lover of justice. It has been over and over again stated, that the Roman Catholics of this country are, and have always been, in reference to the elective franchise, the subservient tools of the priesthood; that the clergy have

only to indicate for whom they shall vote, and all individual preferences are at once lost sight of, in order that the whole Catholic body may show an undivided front in favor of those men and measures previously selected for their suffrages by the heads of the Church. A more wicked libel than this has never been promulgated on any body of men. There is not even the semblance of truth in it. It is known to you, that my political affinities have always been towards the Whig party, as have also been those of a large majority of the Roman Catholics of Kentucky. The foreign element of the Catholic population—and the same may be said of that of every Protestant denomination, the Protestant Episcopal Church, perhaps, excepted—is as well known to you to be Democratic in its tendencies. If the Catholic clergy have used the supposed influence, appertaining to them as spiritual guides, to induce the Catholic people to vote in any particular way, how do you account for this diversity of political predilection between the two classes of native and foreign born Catholics?

But I will still go further, and record it here, as my deliberate opinion, based upon observation and intimate personal relations with a great many Catholic clergymen, both native and of foreign birth, that a considerable majority even of the latter class, have heretofore favored the principles of the old Whig party. They have not done this, to be sure, by endeavoring to influence their people to vote in accordance with their own private individual sentiments. This was no part of their duty as ambassadors for Christ. And had they done so, though you and your party might not have then thought proper to bring this charge against them, of undue interference in matters not directly appertaining to their calling, the opposition party doubtless would have so charged them. Thus, the inference is perfectly plain, that the Catholic priesthood are to be held accountable for a course of conduct, which, had they truly followed, as has been charged against them, would have saved them from all blame, so far, at least as you and your party are concerned.

The Roman Catholics, among all the religious bodies of this country, are the least chargeable with being attracted by the divers *isms* of the day, whether they be of a religious or a political character. Mormonism, and Millerism, and Fourierism count no Roman Catholics in their ranks. They are equally free from Abolitionism, Freesoilism, and Fillibusterism. Always conservative, they are calm and fair in their

opposition to what they deem error in politics and religion. They never suffer their preferences to lead them beyond the pale of social courtesy, or to render them regardless of the duties imposed by heaven-born charity. Intolerant, if you please, of the principle of Protestantism, they recognize the universal law of the Church and its Founder, to know no man's religion when it is a question of the relief of distress, or of the general good.

If there be any man so credulous as to believe that the leaders of the Know-Nothing party, in appending to their political creed this element of political proscription on account of religious faith, were actuated by motives of true patriotism, and really feared for the safety of our peculiar institutions, because of principles supposed to be held by Roman Catholics dangerous to the same, he is greatly mistaken. They had no fear of the kind, and you have no such fear. They, unfortunately, found in the minds of great numbers of Protestants and nominal Protestants, an intense prejudice against the Catholic Church. This prejudice had been suffered to run riot in places where a Roman Catholic was never seen, and was daily added to by the circulation among the illiterate of gross and lying publications, concocted for profit by men who knew no more of Catholic usages than they did of decency, and which presented to the unwary eyes of our youth a tissue of baseless charges against Catholicity, intermixed with beastly and obscene incidents. Knowing the existence of this widespread spirit of fanaticism, and believing that they could turn it to political advantage, by enlisting against the old Democratic party a greater number of its then adherents than they would lose thereby of Catholic Whig votes, the Know-Nothing leaders tackled to their clumsy craft, launched at midnight on the muddy waters of civil discord and sectional strife, this rotten plank of Catholic proscription. The Democrats must be beaten at any cost. What matters it, if it be necessary in order to do so, that the constitution shall be trampled under foot, and the demon of religious bigotry let loose in the land to destroy all the flowers of social happiness! The plunder must be obtained, said they, and we will make use of this feeling of hostility to Catholics, in order to humbug the ignorant and bigoted of the Democratic party into assisting us in our schemes. The conservative policy of Clay and Webster was lost sight of in the determination to appropriate the offices of government. Many of the preachers were induced to enlist in the cause. The pulpit

was changed into a rostrum for political harangues, and a number of these misguided men were even seen to join with secret, oath-bound plotters, to impose upon our beloved country, a policy positively subversive of all liberty, civil and religious. But by the mercy of an overruling Providence, the cunning of all concerned has overreached itself. The degraded leaders, panderers as they were to the worst passion of the human heart, and that, too, for base and selfish ends, reckoned not on that inherent love of justice, which is still, thank God, the chief glory of a vast majority of the American people. They reckoned not on the intelligence and patriotism of those true men of the old Whig party, who scorned the slavery of their oath-bound faction, and whose fidelity to the teachings of the constitution was not to be purchased. The preachers, too, who possibly thought they were doing God a service in forsaking the Gospel of peace, in order to convert the Catholics from the errors of their ways, by inculcating a system of civil disabilities not recognized by the gospel—they, too, have overreached themselves. In every town and village throughout the country—even in those where the face of a Roman Catholic never was seen, there have been raised up from the ranks of both the old political parties, apologists for the Church, and defenders of the patriotism of her American members. Even from the body of the preachers themselves, have come most withering rebukes of the spirit of fanaticism that had unfortunately fastened itself on the minds of so many of the brethren. All honor to these conscientious preachers and true Americans! My faith has no affinity with their religious opinions; but of the honesty of their convictions I have no doubt. They have shown themselves the uncompromising advocates of that conservatism which I once thought the peculiar attribute of the Whig organization. They have read aright the page on which is inscribed the charter of our constitutional liberties. Not only this, but they have read aright that higher page of God's law, which inculcates the duty of charity, and forbids the assumption by man of His eternal attributes. And not only this, but they have read aright that page of the book of common sense, which teaches as the experience of all time, that religious faith, or even preconceived opinions on matters of less importance, can never be uprooted from the mind, by political disabilities on account of such faith, or of such opinions. I am glad to believe that many of the preachers who had been induced, from, perhaps, a natural feeling of

opposition to what they esteemed error in the religion of the Roman Catholics, to make common brotherhood of political mountebanks and tricksters in Know-Nothing lodges, becoming aware of the false position they had assumed, have severed all connection with the party. Let them still withdraw from the disgraceful association, and every man with them who has a soul to feel for the honor of his country. Let them do but this, and while peace and good-will shall resume the places usurped by discord and fanaticism, the very name of the political monster whom they served, will soon become a myth in the land which he had hoped to govern, and, in governing, to ruin.

You may perhaps say, that now, at least, the Roman Catholics of this country do show an undivided front in opposition to what you mis-name the American party. You may even charge this result to the influence of the priesthood, though the compliment would be a poor one, both to the feeling of self-respect in the hearts of the Catholic people, and to the judgment of the clergy in supposing the exercise of such influence on their part at all necessary. It would be wonderful indeed, if the Catholics were not, to a man, ranked among the opponents of the Know-Nothing faction. This is the faction that has falsely charged them with holding allegiance not compatible with that which they owe to the constitution of their country. This is the faction that is seeking to degrade them socially and politically. This is the faction that has slandered them in their religious faith and practice, and which bears on its banners the open declaration of "war to the hilt" against them. This is the faction that has already caused the shedding of innocent Catholic blood, and desecrated houses erected in honor of the living God. Finally, this is the faction whose adherents seem to have been permitted in our day to prove themselves worthy of the brotherhood of Shylock, and to be able to say with their anti-Christian prototype:

"I hate him, for he is a" *Catholic*.

Let all men be careful how they enter this Know-Nothing school of hatred. The beneficent God never intended that his children should permit the seed of this baneful passion to be implanted in their hearts; much less that it should bud and bloom there, and produce its natural fruits of strife and bloodshed. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer."

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, September 26, 1855.

LETTER FIFTH.

SIR :— I have now before me your four articles on “The Papal Controversy.” They look alike, and they read alike. Take from each the matter of a hundred lines, and they would be all substantially alike. In all are found the same *ad captandum* charges, unsupported by any reliable evidence or reference ; the same denunciations of Catholic practices, which you neither understand, nor care to understand ; the same evidences of your un-Christian self-righteousness, and your contempt of others ; the same anti-Catholic bigotry and anti-republican short-sightedness.

It is clearly impossible for any one to make headway in a discussion so conducted. I have called for proofs, and am met by mere assertions. Bare assertion, according to all the rules of logic, calls only for bare negation. If you are not satisfied with my *nego totum*, in the name of reason and common sense, bring out your proofs, and in such a garb, and with such distinct references to original documents. chapter and page, that I may have the opportunity to examine for myself. When I assure you that one-half of what you assert against Catholic belief and practice is absolutely false, and that the remainder is a miserably garbled and twisted perversion of facts, I say what I am able and willing to prove, whenever you shall give me the opportunity to do so.

Your last article, as well as the three which have preceded it, contains no proof to support the charge brought against the American hierarchy of “political aggression ;” nothing to show a want of sympathy for our civil institutions on the part of the Roman Catholics of the United States ; nothing to indicate to a reasonable man that Roman Catholics are not as good citizens and as true republicans as the best Know-Nothings in the land.

The olla podrida dish of anti-Catholic invectives, which you have weekly set before me, begins to assume “an ancient and fish-like” appearance, not at all provocative of appetite. Were it not for the slightly peppery condiments which you have been kind enough to intermix with your usual ingredients, in this your last effort at intellectual no-popery cookery, I should be compelled to forego any attempt upon it at all.

First, in order to set your mind at rest upon a question which seems to trouble you not a little, permit me to say

again, as I have said before, that the letters of "A Kentucky Catholic" were not written for the purpose of defending Catholic doctrines. The dogmas of the Church need no defense from me. Though I may be both willing and able to give "a reason for the faith that is in me" to any one who will courteously ask it, yet I fully concur in the views of most Catholic theologians, that public discussions on doctrinal points, should, as a general thing, be left to those who have made such matters the study of their lives. No intelligent man can gainsay the reasonableness of such a conclusion. You say that it is anti-republican. I deny that it is so. Common sense has more to do with it. Theology, like physic and law, is a science requiring years of study properly to understand and be able to expound. There are certainly good Christians and firm believers in the very lowest walks of life, for the gift of faith is for all who will ask with the proper dispositions; yet, you will not be prepared to say, that such are equal to the task of convincing the educated unbeliever and casuist. Judges, as well as writers and lecturers on civil law, are expected to be learned in the science; and the same may be said of medical practitioners and lecturers. Is the science of religion, of the covenant between God and his creatures, of less importance than those sciences relating only to man's civil and personal well-being? Assuredly not. I grant you that it is frequently the case that the earnest faith and good example of even the most unlettered persons, have the effect to convert men far removed from them in learning and knowledge. But in the great battle between *faith* and *unbelief*, there is a necessity that the teacher, "sent of God," should be learned in the science of God, in order that he may be able to reason logically and clearly from the premises laid down in the Divine Law.

Your idea that the restriction imposed upon the layman, in forbidding him to engage in public discussions upon points of doctrine, unless by permission of his *ordinary*, is "anti-republican," is simply an absurdity. I have the privilege to accept or reject the teachings of the Catholic Church or any other church. It is to be presumed that when I do attach myself to any particular church, it is upon the principle that what that church teaches is in accordance with my views of divine truth. I may not impugn one of her laws, and still consider myself a consistent member of her communion. In resigning my will to the captivity of faith, whatever I assume, is assumed voluntarily, and with my eyes open. It is

just as anti-republican in the Baptist Church to require the submission of the will of the new convert to the act of immersion, as it is in the Catholic Church to require the obedience of her members to whatever her discipline requires. Republicanism has nothing to do with one or the other.

As to my own particular case, no one is more fully aware than yourself, that the questions I have proposed to discuss are entirely unconnected with the dogmas of the Catholic Church. For instance, it is no doctrine of the Catholic Church that her Bishops shall be "political aggressors." It is no doctrine of hers that "faith is not to be kept with heretics." It is no doctrine of hers that the Catholics of this country "owe civil allegiance to the Pope." It is no doctrine of hers that Protestants shall be "cursed" by every priest in the United States, either "privately" or publicly, on "Holy Thursday," or any other day. It is no doctrine of hers that a simple layman may not, without the previous consent of his Bishop, stand up in defense of the civil rights of himself and his brethren, whenever these rights are assailed from any quarter whatever. Finally, it is no doctrine of hers that such a layman shall refrain from calling things by their right names, even at the risk of offending the delicate nervous organization of a Know-Nothing editor.

Having never questioned "the Bishop of this diocese" as to whether or not he would "indorse" what you term my "insulting expressions" in reference to Know-Nothingism, I am unable to give you the information you require on this point. Since the appearance of your last article, however, I have consulted several good old-line Whigs and Democrats, all sound Protestants, who have offered to make *affidavit* that the expressions complained of are all sound expressions, and true as they are sound.

You say that you "have treated a 'Kentucky Catholic' with a respect that he is not entitled to," and that "the opprobrious terms he has seen fit to apply to the American party demanded a different style of remark." What do you call respect? Is it respectful to say, in the face of my solemn denial, that I hold opinions which would make me a traitor to the government under which I was born? Is it respectful to caricature my faith, and hold me up to public contempt? Is it respectful to call me "corrupt," "superstitious," "unpatriotic," and "aggressive?" Is it respectful to say that I am unfit, because of my faith, to serve my country in any position to which she might call me? Is it respectful to

recommend the formation of secret societies for the avowed purpose of practically annulling in my regard the spirit of the constitutional compact by which my rights are secured? Is it respectful to swear, as you have done in your dark-lantern assembly, not only that you will not vote for me were I a candidate for any office, but that you will break off all "social" relations with me? Shall I, with "fawning humbleness," say to the party which kicks me into the gutter, *wait till I rise and kick me again?* Respect, forsooth! Why, you would treat an ill-natured cur with more respect than you are now according to Roman Catholics, though born on the soil, and equal to yourself in all those qualities which mark the patriot, the Christian, and the gentleman.

You do not like the "expressions" used by me in reference to your bogus American party. I scarcely supposed **you** would. And yet, the terms used, were "good-set terms," and "marvelous proper" expressions. Secret political associations, even when organized without the element of religious proscription, have always been "disgraceful." It is, but a few years since you yourself so designated them, and in much stronger language than I have "seen fit" to adopt towards them. You were wont to call the Native American party, a faction with but *one idea*, and you roundly rated it for its proscriptiveness. Is it less proscriptive now, that it has added to the number to be proscribed the *native born* Roman Catholic? Does the addition of this second half idea to the one idea of Native Americanism, alter the features of the party so much as to take from it the proscriptiveness of which you complained? You have doubtless had your reasons for so material a change of opinion on the subjects of religious proscription and secret societies. Iago's injunction, "put money in thy purse," may indicate their character.

Can you say, that you are not "pandering" to popular prejudice, when you endeavor to raise a wall of separation, socially and civilly, between the Protestant and Catholic? Can you say that the constant stream of vituperation and calumny which you are pouring upon the faith of the Roman Catholic, is not calculated, and well calculated, to make him hated and condemned by Protestants? There are almost daily instances of our clergy being insulted on the streets, by young boys, and even young girls. Where do these children learn such precocity of hate? In the family circle, no doubt, where your fanatical tirades are read, and freely commented on. Are you not, then, engaged in establishing and pro-

moting a most extended "school of hatred?" In doing this, you have not the excuse of the bigot. He is insane, and is scarcely responsible for his acts. But you were not born yesterday, nor has your education been in the school of intolerance. You do know, or ought to know, the almost certain effects of the principles you are advocating. The horrible atrocities, which, from one end of the country to the other, have marked the pathway of your party, give unmistakable evidences of what may be expected from it, should your views be adopted by a majority of the American people. You are not battling for constitutional liberty; this is already secured to you, and to every free citizen on our soil. The legitimate consequence of that fanatical hatred of Catholics, which, whether you know it or not, you are laboring to disseminate in the hearts of the people, can be none other than the license of the mob, free from all legal restraint, to cut Catholic throats, to desecrate Catholic altars, and to overturn, at the same time, those "peculiar institutions" of our country for which you affect so much regard.

I speak to you not as a Catholic, but as an American citizen, when I say, and mark my words, the days of your anti-republican faction are numbered. The hand-writing is even now on the wall, which will consign its pernicious principles to the pit when they had exhaled, as a dark cloud in the moral atmosphere, causing the true lover of his country to tremble for the safety of his hopes in the perpetuity of our institutions, and gladdening the political freebooter with the prospect of plunder in the general devastation which it threatened. The contemptible party trick by which Know-Nothingism had attempted to gain to its ranks the whole Protestant vote of the land, under the maliciously slanderous plea that Catholics were dangerous citizens, has proved a miserable failure. Many Protestants, indeed, were caught in the trap so artfully laid for them; but the great majority have seen through the shallow device, and have spoken out in manful and stern rebuke of the iniquity of those, who would here raise the standard of persecution, against any, even the weakest religious body in the land. The patriotic blood which once held its course in the veins of their liberty-loving sires, has not lost its virtue in the hearts of the children, to still pulsate for freedom, civil and religious.

They have looked upon their Catholic fellow-citizen as he is, and not as you represent him. They have seen that he was as ready to shed his blood at the call of his country as

were any of his traducers. They have seen that when clothed in official authority, he has modestly borne his honors and faithfully discharged his duties. They have recognized in him no laggard in the promotion of the public good, in the advancement of knowledge, and in all that relates to the charities of life and its social requisites. They claim no authority to be the judges of his religious faith, which they clearly perceive does not prevent him from being a good friend, a good neighbor, and a good citizen. Free, themselves, to worship according to conscience, and recognizing the wisdom of those time-honored precepts left them as an inheritance by their fathers, they do not find themselves called on to abridge the rights of others. With views so manifestly just on the part of the great body of the Protestants of the Union, do I not well say that the doom of your proscriptive party is already pronounced! Let it perish; and so perish every political faction that shall attempt to lay a sacrilegious hand on the Constitution.

I have prepared a critical review of many of the charges which you have brought against the Catholic Church, but the increased length it would give to this letter compels me to defer it. Whenever the editor of the *Courier*, for whose extreme courtesy I am under many obligations, shall find room for its insertion, I will again pay my respects to you.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, October 12th, 1855.

LETTER SIXTH.

SIR : According to the promise made in my last, I shall, in my present letter, endeavor to point out to you some few of the many misrepresentations, inaccuracies and positive fallacies, which have appeared in your several articles, on what you term the "Papal controversy." The evidences which you have adduced, clearly taken at second-hand, from books made up by prejudiced caterers to the diseased tastes of those who have been taught to believe everything evil of Catholicity, are not such as you should present, or I receive. The simple catechism, which is placed in the hands of our children, will give you a much better notion of Catholic doctrine. This, at least, contains an acknowledged com-

pendium of our faith. It is extremely easy for those who have a motive to do so, to twist the "worst into the better cause," and fully as easy for them to reverse the proposition, and to make that appear evil which is in reality good.

There are some men, whose greatest happiness seems to consist in making objections. Were such a one a lawyer, he would go into extacies over a flaw in an indictment, which would have the effect to place society at the mercy of an acknowledged thief, burglar or murderer. When a man of this character is taken with the mania for religious discussions, he at once sets his wits to work to improve on the revelation of God, and generally ends either in originating a new system of religion from the vagaries of his own brain, or in being domiciled within the precincts of an insane asylum.

Of all such, pride and selfishness are the ruling passions — the pride to be esteemed wise by their fellow-men, and the selfishness to despise the wisdom of others. Doctor Walton, a Protestant divine, in the preface to his Polyglot says, that "Aristarchus heretofore could scarce find seven wise men in Greece; but that, in his time, so many idiots were not to be found, for all were *divinely learned*." The times have not much altered in this respect since Doctor Walton's day. Could the old Doctor but "revisit the glimpses of the moon," and cast his spectacled eyes over your columns of objective, nonsense, he might well say — "Save us from our friends." Thus far by way of prologue.

First — The great bugbear through which you are endeavoring to frighten your readers out of their propriety, and make them the "fools of their own imaginings," is nothing more than a fanciful picture of the doctrines *imputed* to the Catholic Church, of the Temporal Power of the Popes and the Deposing Power. These powers, now obsolete, were never looked upon as dogmas of the Church, and their assumption, on the part of the Popes of the middle ages, was the result of circumstances in the history of the times, which not only justified, but imperatively demanded the exercise of them at their hands. You would much better understand the necessity which impelled the Popes to assume and exercise these powers, were you to read the History of the Times of Innocent the Third and Gregory the Seventh, by the Protestant historians, Hurter and Voigt. I can scarcely hope, however, that your love for truth is equal to such an undertaking. Suffice it to say, that the Pope, in those days, was the recognized umpire in all disputes between

Christian nations. Bad princes often attempted, in defiance of the Canon-law which was engrafted on their civil codes, to interfere in the acknowledged rights of the Church. They claimed the nomination of incumbents to Episcopal sees, and frequently so managed that bad men were installed into positions in the Church where they gave causes for public scandal. In ridding themselves of the responsibility imposed by their religion, to respect the rights of their Church — rights which never interfered with the administration of good government — these princes seldom, if ever, failed to become tyrants in the worst sense of the term, bloodthirsty and immoral. The people, so much oppressed, before revolting from the authority which had so abused its position, in order that the Head of the Church should ratify the voice which had already spoken in their hearts, had recourse to the Popes, to gain the sanction of the Church to purposes demanded of them by the rights of humanity. It is a well known fact, that whenever the Popes did interfere in the administration of temporal governments, it was in order to protect the people from tyranny and oppression, and their privilege to so interfere, was a privilege distinctly recognized by the governments themselves. It follows, therefore, that it was not an usurped privilege.

By a uniform understanding, then, of all Christian nations, the Popes were recognized, not precisely as having power to depose kings, but as being the judges for the people of the justice and wisdom with which they reigned. Is it not a little singular, that, in our day and in our country, men are to be found, who, though professing the republican principle, that all governing power is directly referable to the will of the people governed, can yet find no language sufficiently strong in which to denounce the action of the Popes of the middle ages in asserting and vindicating the rights of the people against kingly oppression and tyranny? As republicans and as men, they should be thankful that there was a power in those days equal to the task of protecting the people. Bigotry, however, is always inconsistent, and never more so than when the Papacy is the subject of its aspersions.

The criterion of truth, and test of sound doctrine in the Catholic Church, is the golden rule "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*" — "What has been held ever, and everywhere and by all." The questions, then, of the Temporal Power of the Popes and the Deposing Power, are to be tried by this rule

I. The exercise of these powers was unheard of in primitive times ; therefore, the doctrine could not have been *held always*.

II. Many of the Fathers of the Church are distinct in marking out the dividing line between the spiritual power and the temporal power ; therefore, the doctrine was not advocated *by all*.

III. At no time have these powers been exercised over all nations ; therefore, the Church "everywhere" has not acknowledged them. To the proofs :

1. Christ has said, "Give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." The Saviour, in this, distinctly teaches, that those to whom is given temporal power, are to be obeyed ; but, He as distinctly implies, that what is due to God shall not be rendered to the government. The Apostles, the Popes for ages, and the Martyrs of every age, though they accorded to the temporal rulers true civil allegiance, have preferred rather to suffer death than to abridge the Almighty of that service which He alone might claim.

2. St. Paul vindicates the Christians, whom the Romans confounded with the Jews, when they, on the pretense that it was derogatory to the people of God to submit to heathen dominion, had brought the armies of Rome to the gates of their city, by saying that "Every soul must be subject to the higher powers ; there is no power but from God, and those that resist receive damnation to themselves."

3. St. Justin, martyr, says, "The Christians worship God only ; they are subject to the emperor in all things else."

4. Many of the Fathers lay down the broad rule that "Kings have none above them but God alone, who made them Kings."

5. Canon law declares that "Kings acknowledge no superior in temporals, and that appeals concerning temporals shall not be brought to the Pope's tribunal."

6. St. Augustine, speaking of the early Christians, says, "They could, at their pleasure, have deposed Julian, but would not, because they were subject from necessity, not only to avoid anger, but for conscience and love, and because our Lord so commanded."

7. In the same connection, Tertullian asks, "Should we want numbers and forces if we had a mind to be open enemies?"

8. Cardinal Damianus, speaking of the king Iom and the

priesthood, says, "The proper offices of each are *distinct*, that the king may use the arms of the world, and the priest be girt with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

9. You say that, "Pope Pius the Seventh, in his instructions to his Nuncio at Vienna, proclaimed his rightful authority to depose kings and dissolve oaths of allegiance." I pronounce the whole charge *false*, and challenge your proof.

10. You say that the present Pope, "by his brief issued in 1851, in reference to the South American Bishops, boldly proclaimed the doctrine of temporal allegiance to the Holy See." This charge is of the same character, and was doubtless obtained from the no-popery storehouse of ready-made falsifications, where certificates to prove any absurdity are manufactured to order.

11. Gallicanism did not consist in merely a disclaimer of the temporal power of the Pope, as you would make appear. It aimed at such liberties in discipline and worship as threatened to make a *National Church*, severed from unity. This the Pope resisted. When it was question of framing a concordat with France, Pope Pius the Seventh stated, that the first article in the Gallican declaration of 1682, regarding the indirect temporal power of the Pope, could not be insisted on by Rome. (See Bouvier's Theology.)

12. One more evidence on this point, and I have done. I find the following extract of a letter from Cardinal Antonelli embodied in an article published in the last number of the Baltimore Metropolitan Magazine, on this very subject of the "Temporal Power of the Popes." The article to which I refer has been attributed to the pen of one of the most able and learned of the American Bishops. The letter of Cardinal Antonelli was written on the part of the Congregation of the Propaganda by the authority and command of Pius VI, to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, in reply to a letter of theirs addressed to his Holiness, at their meeting in Dublin in the year 1791. It is as follows :

"Most Illustrious and Most Rev'd Lords and Brothers,

"We perceive from your late letter the great uneasiness you labor under since the publication of a pamphlet entitled *The Present State of the Church of Ireland*, from which our detractors have taken occasion to renew the old calumny against the Catholic religion with increased acrimony, that this religion is by no means compatible with the safety of kings and republics; because, as they say, the Roman Pontiff being the Father and Master of all Catholics, and invested with such great authority that he can free subjects of other kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to kings and

princes: he, has it in his power. they contend, to cause disturbances and injure the public tranquillity of kingdoms with ease. We wonder that you could be uneasy at these complaints, especially after your most excellent brother and apostolical fellow-laborer, the Archbishop of Cashel (Dr. James Butler) and OTHER STRENUOUS DEFENDERS OF THE RIGHTS OF THE HOLY SEE had evidently refuted and explained away these *clanderous reproaches* in their *celebrated writings*."

Second.—You charge upon the Church that she teaches persecution of heretics. This is a falsehood. However individual Catholics may have acted or taught upon this subject, no proof can be furnished that persecution ever was a doctrine of the Church. During the first five centuries of the Christian era, the Fathers of the Church took for their motto the famous saying of Tertullian, "*Non est religionis, religionem cogere*"—"it is not the province of religion to force religion."

1. St. Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, wrote to a Bishop who had beaten one of his clergy for heresy, "That it is a novel and unheard of method of preaching the Gospel, to enforce faith with the cudgel."

2. Two Spanish Bishops, Ithacus and Ursatius, solicited the tyrant Maximus to put the heretic Priscillian to death, from which cause, St. Martin of Tours, and all the Bishops of Gaul and Spain, refused to communicate with the sanguinary prelates; and they were afterwards banished. This Priscillian, by the way, must have been the first of the Know-Nothings, as the maxim of his sect was, that its members should be allowed to swear and forswear themselves, rather than betray their secrets.

3. The Council of Toledo forbids the use of violence to enforce belief, "because," add the Fathers, "God shows mercy to whom he thinks fit, and pardons whom he pleases."

4. The Council of Lateran, under Pope Alexander III, acknowledges that "the Church rejects bloody executions on the score of religion."

5. St. Bernard says, "Let heretics be convinced by words, not blows."

6. St. Augustin, in his letter to Count Marcellin, says, "No doctrine should strike a deeper horror in the human heart than that which teaches that it is lawful to kill any person or persons under the pretense of heresy, and, under the mask of religion, spread the dismal seeds of the greatest evils in the Christian world—murders, dissensions, and wars."

7. An Irish divine who wrote in the last century, says, that

"to suppose it is a principle of Roman Catholics, to murder or cheat any person whatever, for, or under the pretense of his being a heretic, is to suppose them ignorant of the commandments of God," and he adds, "We are never to arrogate to ourselves the power of life and death which God has entrusted to the legislators, and to them alone."

Third.—There is much absurdity and not a little disingenuousness in your attempt to prove that American Catholics owe civil allegiance to the Pope, because they sympathized with him in his troubles during the rebellion of his own subjects in 1848. Did you ever read the history of this rebellion, and are you aware of the character of the men that promoted it? If not, you may be in some measure excusable for not having yourself sympathized with the Pope in the difficulties to which you refer. After the accession of Pius IX, the whole Protestant world was clamorous in its praises of the wisdom of his acts and the purity of his motives. He released or recalled the political prisoners and exiles whom his predecessor had justly punished for their open treason. He labored to improve the condition of his entire people, the Jews included. He paid from his own purse the amounts necessary to release those imprisoned for debt. Living himself in a style of the utmost simplicity, his entire income was employed for the promotion of the public good. But in Rome, as elsewhere, there were men who cared not for God or constitutional freedom. The devil has always his strongest adherents at the door of the Church. Revolution was their object, and no concessions that Pius IX could conscientiously offer them, were acceptable. Thoroughly unprincipled, their idea of liberty only a license to gratify passion, they strove, and for a time successfully, to usurp the reins of government. The Pope was banished, his minister murdered, and a complete reign of terror inaugurated in Rome.

The leaders of the insurrection had been indebted to the clemency of the Pope for the very freedom they enjoyed to walk the streets of the city. Banished or imprisoned by his predecessor for treasonable acts against the government, and reinstated with all their civil privileges by Pius IX, on their promise of future loyalty, they were scarce at liberty before they were again fomenting treason. Their object accomplished, and the government in their hands, what policy did they pursue? Did the new government give any protection to life and property? None whatever. They at once instituted a complete system of espionage, robbery and murder.

The religious communities were ruthlessly driven from their homes, and their property appropriated by the mob; the priests were murdered in cold blood while officiating at the altar or when visiting the sick; the public buildings were rifled; black mail was levied on all who could not or would not join in promoting the horrid atrocities which were publicly perpetrated and publicly boasted of. This is a true picture of what these men did in the sacred name of liberty.

Look at this other picture of the great and good man for whose blood they thirsted. I quote from a letter dated Rome, August, 1849:

"On another occasion the police arrested an individual that was clandestinely distributing copies of a tract entitled 'The History of Pius IX, the intrusive Pope, the foe of religion, and the chief of young Italy.' The Holy Father, hearing of his arrest, had the accused brought before him, asked him a few questions, and then said: 'As your faults affect only me, I pardon you.' The man touched with the generosity of the act, threw himself in tears at the foot of the Pontiff, and offered to name the writers of the pamphlet. 'No, no,' said the Pope, 'let their faults remain buried in silence, and may repentance touch their hearts.'"

Look upon these two pictures, and tell me, upon which will the eye of the *true man*, be he Catholic or Protestant, Republican or Monarchist, best love to rest? Can you "sympathize" with the cut-throat and the robber, and look with abhorrence on the merciful and kind-hearted Pius IX? I can scarcely think it; but if it is so, I can no longer wonder that you should, even here, labor to disseminate prejudices likely to breed outbreaks of popular fury, equal in atrocity to those enacted by the revolutionists of Rome, in 1848.

I have thus far confined myself to noticing the principal objections you make to the Catholic Church, namely, the *Temporal Power of the Popes*, the *Deposing Power*, and *Persecution of Heretics*. There are minor objections which will receive due attention in my next.

To a Catholic, it is not at all wonderful that the enemies of the Church should single out the Papacy as the first object of their attacks. True to the instincts of the great enemy of all truth, whose emissaries, wittingly or unwittingly, they are, they make their fiercest assaults on the citadel of the faith. Blinded by passion, they hope to destroy the Papacy, and thus take from the mighty fabric, whose downfall they contemplate, the keystone by which it is held together. Futile are all their hopes, and imbecile all their efforts! One mightier than they has laid the strong foundations of that edifice, and reared that glorious arch, against which the

"gates of hell" shall rage in vain. The *rock* of Peter, crowned with the everlasting Church of God, though buffeted for ages by the surges of an ever-restless sea, fanned into fury by the passions of men, will still remain, and so long as time shall last, will serve as a beacon to guide the souls of the redeemed to the haven of never-ending peace. The Church of God throughout the whole world, bound indissolubly to this "Rock of Ages," ever suffering and ever triumphant, will still continue to present to all generations the beauty and comeliness with which He hath clothed her, whose eternal beauty she but reflects.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, October 18th, 1855.

LETTER SEVENTH.

SIR:—I find that you frequently confound the power of excommunication, as sometimes exercised by the Head of the Church, with the temporal power, which you falsely impute to him. Excommunication is merely a severing from the communion of the Church, and is a power claimed and exercised by every Protestant denomination. The word *anathema*, in the form of excommunication of the Catholic Church, is the very word given by St. Paul in this connection. What do you think of the authority?

2d. The "Bulla in Cœna Domini," which you woefully misrepresent, has not been pronounced, even in Rome, since the days of Clement XIV, nearly one hundred years. By this bull, it is true, all heretics were excommunicated, or cut off from the communion of the Church; but this is nothing new. It mainly embodies forms of excommunication against robbers, extortioners, pirates, oppressors of the poor, murderers, sacrilegious invaders of holy things, and forgers of Papal documents. Look out, Mr. Editor, or you may come in for your share under this last head, for, if you do not really "forge Papal documents," you are at least taking on trust those already forged to your hand. Such a forgery is the pretended bull of Innocent III. Neither that Pope, nor any other that ever lived, has intimated the monstrous proposition that "no faith ought to be kept with heretics."

3d. You say that "in the United States it is the duty of the priests to invoke a curse upon all Protestants ; but they do it *privately* on the morning of the 'Thursday before Good Friday.'" In this charge there is not one atom of truth. Every priest prays *publicly* for all heretics on Good Friday.

4th. Why do you not give a translation of the form of excommunication found in the "Pontificale Romanum?" You will find it quite a different affair from the fanciful production of the author of "Tristram Shandy."

5th. Though anxious to find the passage which you quote from the "Roman Catholic Breviary," I have been unable to set eyes on it. Will you do me the favor to indicate upon what page occurs the sentence, "Whoever says the Roman Catholic Church is not infallible, let him be accursed."

6th. Where did you come across the ridiculous idea embodied in the following paragraph from your article of the 3d inst :

"We did not say, however, that the Bible was totally denied to the people. The Church does allow the English to have the Bible in French, the French to have it in English, the Dutch to have it in Russian, and the Russians in Hebrew — and all to have it in Latin, or in any other language than the one they happen to understand."

There is not one word of truth in this, and its absurdity will be palpable to every Catholic and to every well-informed Protestant. There is scarcely a Catholic family in the State of Kentucky that does not possess a copy of the Bible, and I doubt exceedingly if you will be able to find a single one not in the language vernacular to its possessor, except in the libraries of those sufficiently learned to read it in the Latin Vulgate, or the original Greek and Hebrew texts.

7th. You are still harping on the Bishop's oath at consecration, and persist in translating *persequar*, "to persecute," and *impugnabo* "to make war upon." A scholar of any pretensions, in seeking for the signification of a term, used frequently to express dissimilar ideas, should look at the connection in which the word is used, before coming to a conclusion as to its meaning in a certain relation. You know that Bishops are positively forbidden to shed blood, or to strike, or to do aught, knowingly, that will cause the shedding of blood. Yet, in the face of your knowledge upon this point, you would make out that they swear to physically "persecute and make war upon heretics." They can scarcely do this without causing the shedding of blood. The true meaning of the word *persequar*, in the Bishop's oath, is "to follow after."

And how *follow after*? Evidently, as the Fathers say, "by argument, not by blows." *Impugnabo*, in the connection used, simply means *to impugn*. And how impugn? By condemning error. If Protestant ministers, on assuming the prerogative to preach the Gospel, do not actually swear to do all this, they must at least believe that their duty requires it at their hands. It is an inconceivable inconsistency to suppose that men, holding that they are "sent of God" to teach the truth, may yet fail to impugn that which is opposed to truth. The Catholic Church is never inconsistent. Whilst she argues that the outward manifestation of religious faith is not to be *forced* on those unwilling to receive it, she as strongly contends that there should be no compromise with error. What would be thought of the physician, who, knowing the uniform bad effects of a certain drug, should yet, without even remonstrating with his patient on the folly of his act, stand calmly by and see him take the perhaps fatal compound? You would condemn him as one unworthy of confidence or respect. So with the clergyman that fails to impugn error wherever he finds it — no confidence is to be placed in his sincerity.

I do not precisely look upon the Protestant who conscientiously impugns what he conceives to be error in the Catholic Church, as a bigot. It is only when his opposition is transferred from the *faith held* to the *individual holding it*, that he assumes the character. Neither do I acknowledge in myself any attribute of bigotry on account of my honest opposition to the errors of Protestantism; because, whilst holding a faith I believe *true*, I cannot be consistent and not impugn whatever I consider *error*. Bigotry, on the contrary, not content with condemning that which to it has the appearance of error, invariably attacks the individual, and seeks, as you are seeking, to "propagate faith with the cudgel." Error is frequently aggressive, for it labors to pull down truth to its own level; but truth is always tolerant, because it seeks, through love, to eradicate error, and to raise the individual to its own stature. Error attacks the motives of men, and is thus always offensive, but truth, respecting their motives, and combatting only their errors, is ever kind and conciliatory. It will do you no harm to study these points at your leisure. You may possibly find them suggestive of valuable ideas, though not in the ordinary routine of your thoughts.

As I have before stated, the *wording* (not the meaning or intent) of the Bishop's oath of consecration, was changed, so

far as the Church in Great Britain and Ireland is concerned, many years ago. For over ten years past, the form used in the United States has been copied from that of Great Britain and Ireland. This change, as I have before intimated, arose from the fact that there were then, as now, men, who knew only enough to make them "wise in their own conceit," who could find no other meaning for the word *persequar* but "to persecute," and who freely translated *impugnabo*, "to make war upon." Such men, doubtless, in reading the passage of Holy Writ, wherein we are counseled to "take heaven by violence," would find themselves imperatively called upon to use "villainous saltpetre" to insure success in their onslaught upon its golden gates. In order to quiet the sensitive nerves of such eminently *literal* individuals, the same power which had given prominence to Messrs. *Persequar* and *Impugnabo*, kicked them out of the formula of the oath. Are you satisfied?

8th. You have, in several instances, endeavored to reflect upon the Catholic Church, by giving *ex parte* statements of the relative morality and temporal prosperity of Catholic and Protestant countries. In treating this subject, I shall draw all my proofs from Protestant authorities, principally from the "Notes of a Traveler," by SAMUEL LAING, Esq., a Scotchman and a Protestant. Temporal prosperity in a nation, if we accept the plain teachings of the Bible, is no criterion of its religious welfare. The Saviour inculcates a spirit of poverty, contempt of riches, and even recommends the selling of all temporal goods, and giving the proceeds to the poor. But it cannot with truth be said, that Roman Catholics are, or ever have been, behind their Protestant brethren, in the paths of science, in the fields of enterprise and discovery, or in the walks of literature and the arts.

1. Mr. Laing, in comparing the relative condition of the English and French laboring classes, proves that the French are "more comfortable," and better satisfied with their condition.

2. He says: "Let us do justice to the French character. Their self-command, their upon-honor principle, is very remarkable. They are, I believe, *a more honest people* than the British. Property is much respected in France, and in bringing up children, this fidelity seems much more carefully inculcated by parents than with us."

3. Mr. Laing asserts that the Catholic population of Prussia is more industrious, enterprising and wealthy than the Protestant population of the same kingdom.

4. He very pertinently asserts, that of "all the populations in Germany, those which have their points of spiritual government without their States and independent of them, as the Catholics have at Rome—enjoy certainly more spiritual independence, are less exposed to the intermeddling hand of civil power with their religious concerns, than the Protestant denominations, which, *since* the Reformation, have had Church and State united in one government, and in which the autocrat sovereign is *de facto* a *Home-Pope*!"

5. Our traveler speaks of the people of the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland as presenting more evidences of prosperity than their Catholic neighbors, but that *morally* and *religiously* they are far behind them.

6. Speaking of the Italians, he says: "It is in truth, neither the bad government nor the bad religion of Italy, which keeps her behind the other countries of Europe. The blessings of Italy are her curse. Fine soil and climate, and an almost equal production over all the land, render each man too independent of the industry of his fellow man." Having attended a festival gathering of the lower classes in Venice, he remarks, "I did not see a single instance of inebriety, ill-temper, or unruly boisterous conduct."

7. Mr. Laing says that in Protestant Prussia, "chastity, the index-virtue of the moral condition of a people, is lower than in almost any part of Europe." He speaks of Sweden, the ultra-Protestant State of all Europe, as thoroughly immoral, the proportion of illegitimate births in Stockholm being as "one to one and a half."

8. He says, "The Prussians morally are slaves of enslaved minds, being under a system of compulsory education, compulsory religion, compulsory military service, and the finger of government interfering in all action and opinion."

9. The most thoroughly Catholic country in all Europe is Belgium; and her inhabitants are not behind those of any State in all those qualities which are indicative of a moral, prosperous, and happy people.

10. In conclusion, on this subject, permit me to give an extract from a letter lately addressed to the Rev. J. B. McFERRIN, of the Methodist Church, by Col. O. A. LOCHRANE, a Protestant, of Macon, Georgia. He says:

Is it not known to you that Luther himself said the morals of Germany had decreased since the abolition of the confessional, and is it not a melancholy fact that in England the Protestants of the lower class are fearfully immoral? Take three counties, Lancashire, Norfolk, and Herefordshire, and on the authority of Dr. Durbin, an American Wesleyan Methodist, we find

that Lancashire, with a population of 1,667,664, for the years '39-'40-'41, had registered of all illegitimate children the astonishing number of 6 172. Norfolk, with a population of 412,361, for the same time had 2,422 and Herefordshire, with a population of 114,438, had for the same time 681; deduct the minor population, and then the adult males, and you have confirmed the statement of Mr. Gee, of Lincolnshire, himself an Englishman, who said of the low female class working in fields, out of fifty there were forty-nine cases of delinquency. Contrast this statement with Ireland where the people are poorer, the habits of life more seductive and social, and yet how anomalous the change; their delinquency is rare, not even one out of fifty is guilty of moral delinquency. It has been probably well said that virtue was indigenous to Irish soil, but it has taken cultivation to make it perennial. "*Ecce iis quæ dicta sunt hoc conficio.*"

I now come to a paragraph from your article of the 3d, which shows conclusively an open and bold advocacy, on your part, of a union of Church and State. Look at it, my Protestant fellow-citizens, and ask yourselves if this imported editor is not endeavoring to introduce anti-republican notions in the public mind. Here it is :

Whether church and state are united or not, ecclesiastical and civil tribunals should be alike subject to the sovereign of their own country — with God alone to preside over all. In England they are subject to the king. In Rome, they are subject to the Pope. In America, they should be subject to the people.

By your theory, it would follow that Methodist Conferences, Baptist Associations, and Presbyterian Synods, are all under the jurisdiction of the State, which has the power to modify or abolish them at will! Is this Know-Nothingism? If so, I do not wonder that honest men will have nothing to do with it. Of course, you believe that the fathers of the republic, in embodying in the constitution a guarantee of complete religious freedom to all, only meant such freedom as majorities should be willing to accede to minorities. Now I beg to say to you, I will never believe that you can make "Americans" subscribe to any such doctrine. They will still vindicate the wisdom of the framers of the constitution in proclaiming freedom of religious opinion to every citizen on the soil.

Your principal objections to the Catholic Church, having now received attention at my hands, before concluding this letter, which I trust is the last I shall be under the necessity of addressing you, I wish to ask you to cast a retrospective look over your life, from the time your foot first pressed the soil of Kentucky, up to the day when, regardless of your duty to your God, to your country, and to society, and for ends unworthy of a patriot, you became the leader of a faction, whose vitality was the element of bigotry which it had

assumed, and whose aims and purposes were all unconstitutional. Behold a man welcomed to our soil with true Kentucky hospitality, and cheered on from year to year by liberal hands and sympathizing hearts ; see him the staunch supporter of the State and Federal Constitutions, the advocate of sound principles, and the unswerving opponent of sectional legislation ; see him the rebuker of intolerance, the friend of the oppressed, the defender of the acquired rights of our adopted citizens, and the stern opponent of political trickery and social meanness ; behold him, at all times the consistent friend of the Roman Catholics, making no difference between their rights and privileges, and those of his fellow-Protestants ; see him rebuking the intolerance of the convention of New Hampshire for permitting an odious test-qualification to remain on its statutes ; in a word, behold him the unequaled editor and the right-minded man. Such a one was GEORGE D. PRENTICE.

The picture is not yet finished. All at once, a new party has sprung up in the land — an invisible party, which stalks in the dark, and hides in holes. All that is known about it here in the West, is, that Catholics and foreigners are not permitted to enter its lodges, and that its members are bound to secrecy, not only as to its plans and movements, but as to their own connection with the order. It is thought little of till it is found that the new organization has tricked the old parties out of the offices at most of the elections in the Eastern States. Its precocious strength gives to it a respectability in the minds of many, to which intrinsically it has no claim. The leaders of the movement, becoming bolder, seek to extend its ramifications over the whole land. They write, and preach, and declaim, publicly, of danger to the republic on account of the Roman Catholics. An insane fear of some portending and unknown evil, seizes on whole masses of the people. Suspicions are excited, friendships broken off, and enmities engendered. The Catholics, though none can see that they are at all changed since their fathers of old St. Mary's opened their doors to the fugitives from Protestant persecution, are strangely enough discovered to be deadly foes to "our peculiar institutions." To be sure, they number but one to twenty of the Protestant population, and hold scarce one office in a hundred. But what of that ? They are too strong to be put down by means less extraordinary than secret Jacobinical clubs.

People must be *sworn* not to vote for a Catholic, nor to

hold "social" intercourse with him. The "order" increases with wonderful rapidity. Some are brought into it because of the novelty of the thing, for we are a curious people; some because they do not like the religion of the Catholics, and having been unable to convert them through reason, imagine better success will attend their efforts when armed with a more tangible weapon; some hate the Democrats, and are ready to try any desperate measures likely to procure their overthrow. Some join the lodges with the expectation of bettering their condition, and making business friends; some with the hope of office at the hands of their brethren, and some, good honest souls, with more credulity than brains, because they really believe all the stuff and nonsense preached to them by the leaders of the movement.

But the order is in search of a fugleman for the West, and our gigantic editor has not yet pronounced against the new monstrosity. He is hoping to turn the dark affair to Whig account, and is, in western parlance, "on the fence." Overtures are made him to lead the movement in Kentucky. Too intelligent not to see through the transparent humbug, the ends and aims of which were as repugnant to his judgment as were the means it employed to his tastes, he cannot, at once, make up his mind, even for sake of the pecuniary advantages likely to be gained thereby, to take charge of this child of darkness, and hold it up to his countrymen as the impersonation of republican beauty. Vacillating from day to day — at one time determined to hold to his old course, and stand by Whig principles, without meddling with new issues; and at another, excited by the proscriptiveness of the new party to write a leader which will consign its blundering carcass to the "tomb of the Capulets;" now listening to the inward monitor, and again giving way to the outward pressure, he finally meditates an inglorious surrender.

His party is daily becoming weaker, and the councils of the new order are fast filling up from its almost abandoned camps. Will the editor follow? He cannot yet conclude to do so. He says to himself, how can I advocate principles which I have publicly opposed for so many years? How can I associate with men who are afraid or ashamed to proclaim their policy and mode of action, and who strike in the dark? He firmly resolves to oppose the order; he even writes an article denouncing it, and already speaks of its appearance in his next issue. But the leaders and wire-pullers of the party know the value of their man, and hearing of the

threatened exposure, are determined to prevent it. The character of the arguments used may be readily imagined. No doubt they showed him (on paper) their certain success in the coming elections; the twenty thousand majority in Virginia "already sworn in;" North Carolina, and Georgia, and Tennessee, and Kentucky, and the whole South, already with them; and then, the *perquisites*, which his adherence would insure to the editor! No doubt, too, they held up the scourge of proscription before his face. Still he vacillates. While conscience whispers, *patriotism, reputation, honor*, into one ear, the devil thunders *money* into the other. *Honesty is the best policy*, says conscience. *Money! money!* says the devil. *Consistency, friendship*, says conscience. *Money! money!! money!!!* cries the devil. The trial was too strong; and the omnipotent dollar did the business. Conscience departed, and the editor was alone with his *master*.

But now comes another phase of this crooked affair. **The** editor is not ignorant of his own value, and he is in a position to dictate his terms. We can well imagine him soliloquizing—

"Reason, you rogues, reason;
Think you I'll endanger my soul *gratis*?"

"Shall I fiddle for humbug, and not claim piper's pay? Shall I whitewash treason and bedaub truth with ink, and for 'no consideration?' Never! If I must needs do your dirty work, it shall be to the tune of *shell out*, gentlemen Know-Nothings!"

The fence is cleared, and the editor is on the other side. "In for a penny, in for a pound," is now his motto. The Pope becomes, in the opinion of the editor, the rock on which our republican ship is destined to split. The Catholics are determined to seize on the country, and there is no way of preventing it, except for all to *swear* never to support them for office, and to at once break off all "social" intercourse with them. Hatred must now take the place of confidence in every true "American" heart, and fanaticism must be invoked, even at the risk of bringing down on the devoted heads of the Catholics the mercies of an irresponsible mob.

Do you doubt the truth of the picture? If so, look over the files of your Journal for the last few months, and convince yourself. Here we have a paragraph rebuking the Catholics because *forced* from self-respect to discontinue their subscriptions, and slanderously charging that they hate you, and

would, if they had but the power, "burn you at the stake." Here again we have charges, equally slanderous, that the American Bishops are "political aggressors," that Catholics "owe civil allegiance to the Pope," that the Church inculcates "corrupt practices," and that its members cannot possibly be true republicans. Here we have copious extracts of fulsome adulation of yourself, taken from cotemporary prints, whose editors aspire to nothing better than to be *toadies* to the big gun of Louisville. Again we are presented with specimens of namby-pamby correspondence between provincial belles and our embodiment of all editorial gallantry, on the occasion of the presentation of a silver cup, in which he is lauded to the skies as the very Bayard of Know-Nothings, "*sans peur et sans reproche*." Here we have, in number after number, the published proceedings of the different Know-Nothing Councils, recommending the brethren to rally to the support of the "Organ." Here, again we have boastful paragraphs of the number of his friends and the ever-increasing length of his subscription list. These are followed by an unblushingly implied libel, that the Irish who were shot and maimed and burnt on "bloody Monday," were, on the Saturday previous, incited to preconcerted aggressions on "peaceful American citizens," by the Catholic clergy of Louisville, and that no place was so proper for this "preparation" to commit murder, as the *confessional*, to which these poor persons had repaired in order to obtain strength of Almighty God to enable them to forgive their enemies. Do you yet acknowledge the picture?

I would ask you, before concluding, if the Catholics of this country have ever attempted anything which can possibly be construed into a purpose on their part to destroy or abridge the liberties of Protestants, Jews or infidels? If they have not, would it not be more consistent with justice and honesty, to await some show of the evil intentions which you charge upon them, before attempting to create a distrust of them in the public mind? Even were the slanderous allegation true, and they had any such purpose in contemplation, what possible chance would they have to execute their designs? Have you no faith in the religious principles you advocate?—no confidence in the "invincible power of truth," to correct the threatened evil, that you should go back to the exploded policy of persecution? Do you anticipate that half the Protestants of the land will turn "Papists" if the "arm of the flesh" is not invoked to prevent them? Such must be your

threatened exposure, are determined to prevent it. The character of the arguments used may be readily imagined. No doubt they showed him (on paper) their certain success in the coming elections; the twenty thousand majority in Virginia—already sworn in;—North Carolina, and Georgia, and Tennessee, and Kentucky, and the whole South, already with them; and then, the *perquisites*, which his adherents would insure to the editor! No doubt, too, they held up the sword of prescription before his face. Still he vacillated. While conscience whispers, *patrimony, reputation, honor*, into one ear, the devil thunders *money* into the other. *Honesty is the best policy*, says conscience. *Money! money!* says the devil. *Consistency, friendship*, says conscience. *Money! money!!!* cries the devil. The trial was too short, and the omnipotent dollar did the business. Conscience departed, and the editor was alone with his master.

But now comes another phase of this crooked affair. The editor is not ignorant of his own value, and he is in a position to dictate his terms. We can well imagine him soliloquizing—

"Reason, you reason, reason;
Think you I'll exchange my soul gratis?"

"Shall I fiddle for humbug, and not claim pay?
Shall I whitewash treason and bedaub truth with
'no consideration?' Never! If I must needs do
work, it shall be to the tune of *shell out*, gentlemen.
Noblings!"

The fence is cleared, and the editor
"In for a penny, in for a pound."
Pope becomes, in the opinion of the world,
our republican ship is
determined to sail
prejudice it.

You, as an outsider, have no right to say that. You will not acknowledge that we are in place of the one we hold, but you advocate a principle of union — provocative of incessant division — do you attach to the prayer of the Church the thought might be *one*? or the injunction might be *of one mind*? You recognize as the administration of civil law, though in the books, that there shall be an interpretation. Will you say that the Incarnate, in commissioning his apostles, gave authority, gave to them no rule in teaching, and consequent unity? The Church alone has such a rule, and she addresses to her children the injunction, *they be of one mind*.

But on the striking dissimilarity as between the converts to Catholicity, and the converts to Protestantism and their own inclination to leave the Church? This dissimilarity is the result of your study, and may give you some probable motives by which the two classes might be changing their views of religious truth. Gavazzis, the Achillis, and the Justinis, who have come by Protestantism, with the Newmans, the Wilberforces, who have come under the "attrition" of the Catholic Church! On the whole, you find the learning, the talent, and the character? Which of the two classes will be the most successful in leading souls to God by preaching Christ and Him crucified? The saying of the witty Dean Swift about the Pope's garden, "is as true now as it was in the time of the Reformation," will continue to be true to the end. Protestantism is a religion of the future, which he does not already possess. It can afford him no present happiness, and it is not his business to care. For the word of God, it is not the property of the individual mind, but the property of the Catholic faith, the thought of the Church, incidental to its very foundation. It is a principle, positive, nothing not liable to the changing phases of human opinion.

Unless Bishop Spalding issued to me the subjects I have attempted to treat, I

in opinion. I
ing issued too
tempted to treat

idea, or else you are taking an enormous amount of pains to very little purpose. Whatever others may think, I will still stick to the opinion, that all your no-popery ebullitions are mere political "springes to catch woodcocks," *i. e.* votes for Know-Nothingism, and subscribers for the *Louisville Journal*.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, October 23d, 1855.

LETTER EIGHTH.

SIR: I had hoped that I should not again be called upon to notice attacks from you upon the Catholic Church and its members. I had thought that, even if you were lost to a sense of justice and fairness as to the rights and privileges of your Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, the indignant rebuke of the principle of intolerance, as indicated by the voice of a vast majority of the American people in the recent elections, would have influenced you to abate the rancor of your fanaticism, and given our people some assurance of future peace and quiet. I find little, it is true, either in your article of the 25th October, addressed "to a Kentucky Catholic," or in that of the 15th November, that demands attention; yet there are some things in them which I do not feel disposed to pass over in silence.

You speak most flippantly of what you are pleased to call our "monstrous superstition" and "its endless follies." Would that you understood these follies, and that the moral opthemia by which you are blinded could be so far removed, that you might see the true character of that "monstrous superstition," that "folly of the cross," which, for eighteen hundred years, has been able to count among its votaries the good and the pure and the talented of all peoples and all tongues. It is neither learning, nor talent, nor purity, nor goodness, that the Church has to fear. Her enemies are the devil, the world and its allurements, human respect, pride and concupiscence. No Christian virtue ever lost a soul to the Church.

I cannot conceive what reasonable motives you have for battling, unasked, in behalf of individual Roman Catholics against the Church, in respect to "the right of private inter-

pretation and judgment." You, as an outsider, have no interest in the matter at all. You will not acknowledge that you have a certain faith to offer us in place of the one we hold. Truth is not liable to change; but you advocate a principle — that of private interpretation — provocative of incessant changes. What meaning do you attach to the prayer of the Saviour, that his disciples might be *one*? or the injunction of the Apostle, *Be you of one mind*? You recognize as necessary to the correct administration of civil law, though written and compiled into books, that there shall be an established tribunal for its interpretation. Will you say that Christ, who was Wisdom Incarnate, in commissioning his ministers to teach, as having authority, gave to them no certain rule to insure unity in teaching, and consequent unity in faith? The Catholic Church alone has such a rule, and she alone can consistently address to her children the injunction of the Apostle that they *be of one mind*.

Have you ever reflected on the striking dissimilarity as exhibited in the character of the converts to Catholicity, and of those perverts whom Protestantism and their own inclinations to evil have induced to leave the Church? This dissimilarity is a subject worthy of your study, and may give you some insight into the probable motives by which the two classes are influenced in changing their views of religious truth. Compare the Gavazzis, the Achillis, and the Justinianis, as *enlightened* by Protestantism, with the Newmans, and Fabers, and Wilberforces, who have come under the "monstrous superstition" of the Catholic Church! On which side will you find the learning, the talent, and the exalted purity of character? Which of the two classes will you find winning souls to God by preaching Christ and Him crucified? The saying of the witty Dean Swift about the "weeds from the Pope's garden," is as true now as it was in his day, and will continue true to the end. Protestantism can give nothing to the Catholic which he does not already possess. It can add nothing to his present happiness, and nothing to his hopes for the future. For the word of God, it offers him the uncertain conceptions of the individual mind, and for the unity and fixity of the Catholic faith, the thousand and one vagaries incidental to its very foundation principle. It has nothing positive, nothing not liable to change with the ever-changing phases of human opinion.

You still think that "unless Bishop Spalding issued to me a license" to discuss the subjects I have attempted to treat, I

have "doomed myself to a cord of excommunication," and you flatter yourself that you see a way of involving the Bishop in having "participated in preparing" the letters of "A. Kentucky Catholic," and in "vituperating the American party." I should like to know what connection there is between the doctrines of the Catholic Church and "vituperating the American party?" But you are still reckoning without your host. It is perfectly allowable for any Catholic to lay down facts as they exist, or, in other words, to state what are the teachings of the Church on any given point. Try again! Hunting for "mares' nests" is not usually considered a profitable employment; but you may be able to make it pay.

You say that you do not believe in the rights of kings to rule in temporals, or of the hierarchy to rule in spirituals; that "the claims of each are founded in usurpation; that "it is as anti-republican to bow our heads and hearts to an ecclesiastical hierarchy as it is to a political empire," and that "our religious creed should be as free as our political creed." This you may consider very fine talk, but it lacks the elements of both Christianity and common sense. The reasoning by which you are led to such conclusions is altogether rationalistic and infidel. You can go but a single step further before you are plunged into anarchy as to temporals, and into infidelity as to spirituals. All dominion is from God, and when rulers govern according to justice, their right to rule is directly referable to the will of God. The teachings of the scriptures are perfectly explicit on this point. The action of the fathers of the republic was justified only on the plea of the tyranny and injustice of the government of Great Britain. No other justification was ever attempted to be set up for the revolt of the colonies. This, to be sure, was sufficient; for the eternal law of justice is of as binding force upon kings and rulers as upon the people. Will you say that Saul and David usurped authority when they claimed the right to rule the Jewish people?

But you acknowledge no rights of spiritual rulers. If you mean that they have no rights enabling them to force obedience by physical pains and penalties, I agree with you. As I do not acknowledge any right in the civil government to force conscience, so I do not acknowledge any such right in the spiritual order, from the fact, that this would be interfering with the attribute of free-will wherewith Almighty God has endowed his rational creatures. But this is quite a different

thing from acknowledging that those whom Christ has appointed "to rule the Church of God" have no right to command my moral obedience. You, as a Protestant, must feel a positive obligation resting upon you to obey the discipline of your Church. Therefore, you are no more free to disobey the ecclesiastical rules by which you profess to be governed, than I am to set aside the positive laws of the Catholic Church. When I am commanded by an authority which you will not presume to dispute, to *hear the Church*, I dare not say that the Church has no right to exact my obedience to her laws, because I would thereby offer an insult to the authority by and through which only she claims to exercise the right "to govern," as you say, my "spiritual nature."

I have read the article in Mr. Brownson's Review, to which you have called my attention; and, if you will permit me to say it, though I find some things in it likely to be misunderstood, and something also of uncharitableness in reference to the opinions of many Catholics who differ from him, yet, on the whole, he says nothing calculated to alarm Protestants. He gives an exposition of a principle which forms the basis of true religious liberty. But you certainly misstate and possibly misapprehend the views of Mr. Brownson. The principle he defends is one which, if you be a Christian at all, you cannot yourself condemn. He argues that the law of God is above all human law, and that no law is binding on the consciences of men which contravenes the established and known will of God. This proposition is incontrovertible, and the man who would oppose it, has no conception of the meaning of religious liberty. He says Catholics and Protestants have each a standard by which to judge when human law oversteps its defined path and trenches on conscience; that "every Protestant sect is for its members a representative of the spiritual order," which order is above the temporal and not subservient to it, and that "every Protestant, Jew, or Gentile holds his religion to be for him the law of his conscience, therefore, the highest of all laws." He further says, "Let this be remembered, no Catholic claims any but spiritual authority for the Pope as Vicar of Jesus Christ," and "there never was a Catholic of any note at all who denied the independence and supremacy of the State in its own order." Mr. Brownson, if I understand him aright, claims for the Pope, as the highest authority for Catholics in those matters relating to conscience, the right to judge *for them*, in how far, if at all, the constitution and laws of a

State are opposed to the laws of God. Some may say that this is a claim set up by Roman Catholics for the exercise, on the part of the Pope, of an indirect temporal authority. But so far as this country is concerned, the question has been already decided, nor is there the slightest danger of its ever being mooted, unless upon the destruction of the constitution itself. As Dr. Brownson says, "The Pope in permitting Catholics to take the oath to support and defend the constitution *has already decided* that it contains nothing contrary to the Divine Law. That question is SETTLED FOREVER, and no Catholic can ever plead conscience for not obeying any law passed in accordance with the constitution." The phrase "The Pope in *permitting* Roman Catholics," used by Dr. Brownson, is objectionable, because it implies that the Pope has a power over the temporal order which he does not claim, and which is not accorded to him by the laws of the Church. His decisions are given on questions of conscience, precisely as judicial decisions are rendered in civil affairs, and, as I conceive, after application has been made to him by the parties interested.

The objection which I bring against Mr. Brownson, is not that he states an opinion not held by most Catholics, nor that he fails in his argument to prove its consistency with truth and right reason; but, with true deference to the opinions of the learned reviewer, I hold that he has no right to call that a *temporal* power, even when modified by the term *indirect*, which is in reality only a *spiritual* one. It requires no profound consideration of a reflecting mind, whether Protestant or Catholic, to come to the conclusion that all law, at least in Christian countries, has for its basis the accountability of man to Almighty God for all his actions. This being so, none may say that the Divine law is subservient to human law, and therefore, all will acknowledge that the law of one's conscience is to be held as binding, even against personal restraint, or death itself at the hands of the civil magistracy. If the legislature of Kentucky, for instance, should pass a law, supposing such a thing possible, commanding the Presbyterians to give up their Churches to the Episcopalians, and themselves to conform under certain penalties to the faith of the English Church, the disciples of Calvin would not be slow to assert that the law of their conscience was above the law of the State, and, without waiting for official action on the matter by the General Assembly of their sect, they would refuse to obey the law, preferring to suffer the penalty for resisting it.

But suppose the legislature passed a law which should be regarded by a portion only of the Presbyterians as incompatible with the duty which they owe to Almighty God, what, in such case, would be their action in the premises? Would they not convene the authorities of their Church to decide upon the matter, and would not the action of these authorities be received as a definitive exposition as to what should be the course of the members of the Church in regard to the law? No man in his senses would say that the authorities of the Presbyterian Church claimed by their decision a right to legislate upon temporal matters. So with Catholics—in the State passed a law which clearly interfered with their rights of conscience, they would refuse to obey it, no matter what might be the consequences. But if a doubt arose as to whether or not the law did interfere with conscience, the supreme authority for them, in the last resort, would be the Pope, whose decision, as to the nature of the law, would be final. But the Pope does not here decide upon a question of temporals, however temporals may be affected by his decision. He looks solely and entirely to the paramount obligation of the Catholic Christian, whenever a conflict arises between the civil law and the law of conscience, “to obey God rather than man.”

There is no conscientious act of the Christian which may not be interfered with through the action of ignorant or wicked legislators. But the law of conscience is above all enactments which attempt to put limits to the freedom of faith and worship, supposing such faith and worship not incompatible with good morals and the just rights of others. The rule of any religious body for the precise definition of the duties of its members in the spiritual order, though in some instances it may conflict with temporal things, is not, because of such conflict, necessarily a temporal rule, nor should decisions made by such a rule be looked upon as attempts to control matters outside of the spiritual order. The Pope, in his decisions, whether they be favorable or adverse to laws of questionable obligation on conscience, cannot consider the matter in a temporal light. He is the judge only of questions of conscience, and possesses and exercises only a spiritual power. I, therefore, hold that Dr. Brownson errs in calling that a temporal power, which looks only to spiritual things.

But all Catholics, with the Pope at their head, agree fully that no law passed in accordance with the Constitution of the United States can possibly be opposed to the Divine law;

therefore, the attempt to deprive Catholics of their civil privileges on the plea that they hold opinions dangerous to our institutions as they exist under the Constitution, is nothing more nor less than a sham and an artifice, having for their object the destruction of the Constitution itself, in order to enslave and degrade Catholics.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, November 21st, 1855.

LETTER NINTH.

SIR : I desire to make some comments upon the following paragraphs, which I clip from your article of the 25th of October :

"If you were to disclaim, until you grew black, the owning of *temporal* obedience to the behests of the foreign monarch, it would avail you nothing so long as you continue to recognize his divine prerogative to reign over the spiritual and better part of your nature. * * * *

"Popes, sir, love despotism, and despots love Popery. And, Kentuckian as you are, your own love of liberty could not stand the test when put in competition with your love of Popery. You admit yourself that all the American Catholics sympathized with the Pontiff instead of the people in the revolution of 1848. * * * *

"Indebted to the *clemency* of the Pope! *Republicans* thankful to the *Pope*! Sir, are you not ashamed to talk this way in Protestant America? Is your soul stupified with idolatry? Do you imagine you are writing about the Almighty God himself? *Clemency of the Pope!* *Thankfulness to him for vindicating the rights of the people!* Beautiful language this for a Kentuckian! What right, sir, had the Pope to be in such a position that men must be indebted for freedom to his clemency, or we should be thankful for his vindication of the people? Is he any higher than a King, or any better than the people? * * * *

"You relate this story in devout commendation of the Romish King. It betrays, on the other hand, to our mind the thoroughness of his despotism. As an American citizen, you should have been ashamed to tell the story. As a native Kentuckian, you never would have told it, if the Vicar of Jesus and Jesus himself were not so indissolubly united in your heart, that you have transferred, in all its strength and depth, to the former the deference which is due only to the latter. And thus must it ever be with a Papist. Other citizens of America have sympathized with the Greek Revolution, with South American Independence, and with Hungarian and Italian struggles for liberty. But American Papists, with shame be it spoken, espoused the side of the Pope against the people of Italy. They gloried and still glory in the interference of Austrian and French soldiery. And they would to-day take the part of their *Holy Father* against all the liberties of the world. We say — Down with despots and despotism. Down with Popery and the Papacy. And everlasting hostility to all who sympathize with them, or in any way give them aid and comfort. At the same time we desire to treat with kindness the persons of Papists, and never to molest any of their rights, civil

or religious. And we would rejoice to embrace them as brothers in the sacred fraternity of Republicans. But this can never be done as long as they cling, with the ardor of religion, to the throne of a European monarch. * *

"It now remains to be seen whether you will disown the Romish form of excommunication used against those who draw away virgins from the banner of papal chastity. In point of minuteness, malignity, and variety, the devil himself cannot surpass this curse. As a swearer the devil cannot beat your *Church* unless he can beat this curse.

"This form of excommunication is a composition of Anti-Christ — the Man of Sin — the Son of Perdition — the Great Apostasy — the Whore of Babylon — the Mystery of Iniquity — the Mother of Harlots. If this dreadful personage never imposed fetters or practiced persecution, it certainly displays no mean proficiency in the art of cursing and swearing."

In reference to the first paragraph above quoted, I suppose that you will admit that Almighty God has the right to reign over *your* "spiritual nature," and that you recognize the Divine Voice as speaking to your spirit through some outward system of Church government, whose rules of discipline are binding on your conscience, and with which you do not admit that the State has any right to interfere. So with me, in listening to the teachings of the Church, I recognize the voice of the Founder of the Church, of whose sacred doctrines she is the keeper and the exponent. The only difference between us in this respect is, that while the seat of the authority which claims for you the right to say when the State does interfere with conscience, is in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, or in some other local body of like character, the authority for me, in the same connection lies, in the last resort, in the Supreme Pontiff, not of a local or even national Church, but of the Catholic or Universal Church of God. *Go teach all nations — One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.*

Your saying that "Popes love despotism, and despots love Popery," is as false an assertion as was ever penned. The Popes have always been the most consistent and unswerving advocates of the rights of the people. For centuries the Papacy was the only power able to curb the lawlessness of despotic kings and rulers. To their praise be it spoken, and as an American and a Kentuckian I am neither afraid nor ashamed to say it, the Popes of those ages never shrank from the duty, imposed upon them by their position, of holding up before the eyes of iniquitous rulers, the just judgments of God for the evils of despotism. And "despots love Popery!" Just so much as they love virtue and truth and religion! There never was a despot who was a true child of the Church, and every act of despotism is an insult to the Divine Law as promulgated by the Church. 9

So far from recognizing anything in my religion repugnant to civil and religious liberty, my love of liberty is increased and concentrated, as it were, by my love of Catholicity. The Papacy is a part, and an integral part, of my religion. With the Pope, as "King of Rome," or as "a foreign monarch," I have nothing to do. He asks for no civil allegiance from me, and I owe him none. By a positive law of the Church, of which he is the earthly head, I am commanded to pay true and faithful allegiance to the constitution and laws of my country, nor can I ever refrain from doing so, under the penalty of sin.

But in *spirituals*, in matters of conscience, which both Protestants and Catholics acknowledge to be above all human law, Christ, for me, "speaks by the voice of Peter." I reverence the Vicar of Christ, not as *Jesus*, as you profanely charge, but as having authority from God to decide questions of conscience; and therefore to be revered, in order that I may not fail to pay due homage to Him with whose commission he is charged. "*He that hears you, hears me; he that despises you, despises me.*"

All who have the power, however they come by it, to punish and to remit punishment, are capable of the virtue of clemency; and I again say it, this is the proper word whereby to designate the quality of those acts of forbearance and kindness on the part of Pius IX, to which I referred you. Why should I, as "an American and a Kentuckian, be ashamed to tell the story?" Kentuckians have been wont to give honor to whom honor is due, and to recognize good deeds, no matter by whom enacted. Do you imagine, that you have so much changed them, by inculcating a system of deception and prevarication, as to make them ashamed to tell the truth? Many of my countrymen, doubtless, have been inveigled into the dirty temples of Know-Nothingism, where you, as high priest of the order, are engaged in offering sacrifices, and bloody ones, to the Moloch of Fanaticism; but better counsels will yet prevail, and these men will live to be ashamed, not only of their associates and the unfair means employed by them to compass their ends, but also of their groundless and unjust suspicions of the patriotism of their Catholic fellow-citizens.

"Ashamed to talk this way in Protestant America!" By what right do you undertake to call this land Protestant America? The constitution indicates no such distinctive appellation. You cannot so call it on account of prior dis-

covery, for the Catholics were before you ; nor on account of Protestants having first promulgated within our borders principles of religious freedom, for again the Catholics of the Colony of Maryland were the pioneers of religious toleration ; neither can you because of our civil liberty having been won, exclusively, by Protestants ; for Catholics fought, and bled, and died beside their patriot Protestant countrymen, in order to establish this very liberty ; nor yet can you do so on account of your present numerical strength, for a vast majority of the American people are attached to no religious body, and, according to reasoning based on such an idea, our country might be well called the *America of Indifferentism*. Protestant America, indeed ! This land, let me tell you, is neither Protestant America, nor Catholic America, nor Infidel America, but the *America of Freemen* — but freemen only in the sense of the constitution and right reason ; that is, each citizen is free to act as he pleases, and believe as he pleases, and worship as he pleases, so long as his actions, belief, and worship, are not opposed to the good order of society, and the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges on the part of those who choose to act, and believe, and worship in a different way from himself.

But “ Down with Popery and the Papacy, and everlasting hostility to all who sympathize with them ! ” There is nothing equivocal about this. It is as palpable as a drawn sword, and as threatening as a blunderbuss at your breast. It looks to physical force, and is intended to provoke it. It means civil disabilities and social serfdom to all those American citizens who happen to be Roman Catholics. It means down with the constitution, and up with the rack and faggot. It means death to liberty, civil and religious. But hold ! you “ desire to treat with kindness the persons of Papists, and never to molest any of their rights, civil or religious.” Everlasting hostility to Catholics as sympathizers with the Papacy, and no molestation of their rights, civil or religious ! This is queer, and I am unable to understand it. Perhaps you intend to give to the words *everlasting hostility* only a *Pickwickian* signification, and that, after all, you are sincere in your desire to treat the persons of Papists with all possible respect. Were this so, however, then the acts of mob violence at the last August election, provoked as they were by incendiary appeals similar to that now under review, should have been of a character equally *Pickwickian*. But these were stern realities ; and I very much fear your everlasting

hostility to Catholics, even when modified by your disclaimer of personal molestation, is a reality no less stern.

Perhaps you mean to say, you do not desire that Catholics shall be held as *constitutionally* enslaved and degraded, but only *practically* so. This is a distinction without a difference, and you therein accord to our persons a measure of supposititious kindness, requiring at our hands but supposititious thanks. "Down with Popery, and down with Papists!" but show them all kindness—*after they are down*, we must charitably suppose. "Everlasting hostility to all who sympathize with the Pope!" Shoot, hang, and burn—but take care to do it all in kindness towards their papistical bodies, and in order to indicate how dear to your hearts are their "civil and religious rights." Here is kindness of the true Know-Nothing stamp! Good men are you, and loving!—in fact, you bid fair to rival him who was

"The mildest mannered man
That ever cut a throat or scuttled ship."

You are extremely facetious on what you term the *cursing* propensities of the Catholic Church, and yet you will not acknowledge that her anathemas are any more to be regarded than would be her blessings, so far as their result for evil or good to you is concerned. Here is a strange inconsistency, and it will show conclusively to every candid mind, that when you attempt to justify your interference in the religious affairs of Roman Catholics, by calling in question the right of their Church to indicate what crimes against God's law are just cause for excommunication from her fold, you are only seeking "excuses for malice." The Bible, in a thousand places, tells us of the state of reprobation in which the sinner always stands. But you would have the Church, which Catholics hold to be the exponent of the teachings of the Bible, to gloss over these threats of Divine vengeance. The Church but repeats the anathemas of Holy Writ against the evil doer, and for the very purpose, that seeing his rebellion against God in its true light, and the dreadful penalties which are its consequence, he may "make restitution and come to repentance." The charity of God, which "willeth not the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live," influences her to hold up the awful judgments of the Almighty before the eyes of the unrepentant sinner.

Of a piece with your usual courtesy, when writing of Catholicity, are the expressions by which you designate the

Church of God in your closing paragraph. The Church, to say the least of her, had an existence for centuries anterior to any form of Protestantism. She has included within her pale the brightest intellects the world ever saw, and she has been the nursing mother of saints in every age of her existence. She has been the instrument of the conversion of every heathen nation that has ever been brought into the fold of Christianity. Your own fathers, but a few centuries ago, were her obedient children, and you yourself, indirectly at least, owe to her all that you have of Christianity. She is no *sect*, for she exists everywhere, and as she has always existed, unchanging and unchangeable — “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.” You cannot but acknowledge, that there was a time, when no other Christian Church did exist upon earth. You will also acknowledge, that in the Bible, which you hold to be the rule of your faith, there is recorded a distinct promise of the Saviour to be with his ministry *all days*. It necessarily follows, that if the Catholic Church is not the Church of Christ, He, whom Protestants and Catholics alike, acknowledge to be the God of truth, absolutely failed to make good his promise during *those days* when no other Church had existence. And this is the Church which you blasphemously call “the Son of Perdition” and the “Mystery of Iniquity.” Still, I am not surprised that you should so call her. Insult naturally follows injury. You have causelessly, and in the face of the constitution of our country, banded with bigots to deprive your Catholic fellow-citizens of their civil rights, and it is most fitting that you should insult them in that which is to them their one hope for time and eternity.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, December 4th, 1855.

LETTER TENTH.

SIR: You commence your response to “A Kentucky Catholic,” of the 15th of November, with a paragraph of glorification over the recent Know-Nothing victories in California and Maryland. I see it stated that, in California, your party entirely abrogated the religious test question; consequently, its success was not insured on principles necessarily

repugnant to me as a Catholic. I am individually opposed to the proscription of foreigners, and think that our present laws in reference to immigrants, if rightly administered, are ample for the protection of American interests, so far as our adopted citizens are capable of compromising them. But as there is no reason why a Catholic should not honestly entertain a contrary opinion, I have not considered myself called upon to discuss the subject at all. But, with reference to Maryland, you indicate as one of the principal causes of the success of your party, "that no other State had such an opportunity to witness the atrocities and horrors of Priestcraft and Popery." Will you have the goodness, sir, to indicate a few of those Popish atrocities which have so much horrified the good Protestant people of Maryland? First, of honest GEORGE CALVERT—a Catholic from choice—he, who, at a time when persecution of Catholics was considered a duty incidental to official position, wrote to his Sovereign, on tendering his resignation of the office of Secretary of State, that "being now a Roman Catholic, he could no longer hold his office, because in doing so he must be wanting to his trust or violate his conscience." Of what atrocities was the old Maryland Proprietary guilty? He had the hardihood to refuse to hang up the rebellious Protestant non-conformists of Massachusetts, who had fled to him for protection. Here was an instance of unparalleled atrocity! And CHARLES CARROLL, of Carrollton? He horrified Protestant England by affixing his signature to the Declaration of Independence, and even went to such a length of atrocity as to jeopardize a princely fortune in the cause of American freedom. Was not this an act of unpardonable atrocity? And Archbishop CARROLL?—he was so abominably atrocious as to aspire, and successfully, to the friendship and confidence of such men as BENJAMIN FRANKLIN and GEORGE WASHINGTON, and to have acted with the former in a delicate mission on public affairs to a neighboring colony. Could any man ask for better proofs of the "atrocities and horrors" of Popery in Maryland? Shame on you, for having written so atrocious a calumny! Purer patriots, or better citizens, no State can boast of, than can Maryland in the descendants of the colonists of old St. Mary's.

But what were the atrocities exhibited by the Catholics of Maryland, and which caused the triumph of Know-Nothingism in that State? I will tell you. They were the atrocity of being true to their God and true to their country; the

atrocities of wishing to live in peace and share in the blessings of freedom won by a common ancestry; the atrocity of the lamb, as perceived by the eyes of the wolf, which still sees the stream of our national liberty muddled by the Catholic in his efforts to drink of its waters. These are the atrocities which engender your spleen, and which you and your followers in Kentucky, and your brethren in Maryland, are endeavoring to abate.

You say that it was your "purpose to dissect and resolve the system of Popery into its original elements," and you go on with a column and a half of what, no doubt, you intend for a dissection and resolution of that system, but which, unfortunately for yourself, proves only how little you really know of the nature of the system you would dissect. Polemic theology, like the gun of the redoubtable McFingal, becomes, in your hands, a power, not for the overthrow of your enemies, but for the discomfiture of yourself. Every argument you use is as applicable against the system of Christianity as it is against that of Catholicity. For instance, you say that "the Papal organization has managed to prolong to the present day, through tedious centuries, its horrible existence of fraud and rapine, of superstitious darkness and hardened power." Now, the Papal system, until three hundred years ago, was the only continuous and sustained system of Christianity, recognized as such by the Christian world, if we except that of the Greek Church, whose sacraments and mode of government are identical with those of the Catholic Church. It follows, therefore, and particularly so, inasmuch as the acts for which you most impugn the Papacy occurred previous to the so-called reformation, that the system of Christianity itself, according to your reasoning, and in spite of the Divine promise, that the Holy Spirit should be with it *always*, leading it into *all truth*, was nothing better than "a system of fraud and rapine, of superstitious darkness and hardened power." The "Papal system has *managed* to prolong its existence." It has done no such thing. Almighty God has "managed" to perpetuate his own work. Catholicity, and the Papacy as an integral part of the system, does not depend upon the wisdom of man for its permanency or stability. Were it otherwise than a Divine system, no power of man could have prevented it from being influenced by the all-pervading law of mutation, inseparable from the works of mere human wisdom.

In what sense can you call Catholicity a system of "fraud

and rapine?"—"of power, of finance and superstition?" You seem to infer that her ministers are rapacious of power. Power over whom?—and how to be exerted? Certainly not power over the State in its civil affairs. They ask of the State only the liberty of teaching and ministering, that they may, in the first place, gain souls for heaven, and in the second place, be instrumental, by inculcating the morality of the gospel, in forming good citizens for the State. Can you point to me a single Catholic government on the face of the globe, excepting the States of the Church, in which the Catholic hierarchy exert any more influence over temporal matters than do the Protestant ministers of Great Britain and the United States over the civil affairs of those countries? As Lacordaire says, "The Church asks but a free passage through this world."

"A system of fraud and rapine?" Whom does it rob or defraud? Can you or any other man point to a single piece of Church property in the Union, to which the Bishop, or pastor, or trustees cannot show you a clear title, and which has not been honestly obtained? For what purpose should the ministers of the Church act as robbers? They have no families to aggrandize by the fruits of their frauds, and their style of living is of the simplest kind. Nonsense! my dear sir; you have been reading lying books about Jesuit rapacity until your mind has become diseased.

"A system of finance?" If you mean by this, that the Bishops and priests of the Church are in the habit of speculating in stocks, and lands, and money, even for legitimate objects, you mistake completely in your estimate of their financial propensities. If you mean, however, that their financial acumen is very frequently exerted, for the purpose of raising funds for the building of churches, schools, hospitals, orphan asylums and the like, you are not far from the mark in saying that they are attached to a "system of finance." Of one thing you may be perfectly advised, however great sums may happen to pass through the hands of the Catholic clergy, but little sticks to their fingers in its transit.

Did you ever acquaint yourself with the routine of life generally exhibited by the missionary priest in the United States? Let me picture it for you. The missionary priest seldom has a patrimony of his own, and, consequently, he is at once dependent upon his congregation, in nine cases out of ten, a poor one, for his maintenance. After leaving the seminary, he is appointed to the pastorship of the congre-

gations, if a few isolated Catholic families may be called a congregation, covering often, one, two, three, and sometimes a half dozen counties. The duties pertaining to his pastorate, in so extended a mission, are always arduous in the extreme; that of the confessional, which you seem to think one of his most pleasant employments, being the most so. Liable to be called upon at all hours of the day or night, to attend to sick calls, sometimes at the distance of a day's journey on horseback, he is frequently under the necessity of reading his office (a duty never omitted) while in the saddle, or at an hour when the fashionable ministers of Protestantism are resting after the fatigue consequent on the delivery of an evening discourse. On Sundays, after hearing confessions till perhaps near midday, and afterwards saying mass and preaching, he is permitted, for the first time since the previous evening, to take some refreshment. His day's labor is not yet over; the sick and infirm of the neighborhood are to be visited, the wanderer to be reasoned with and admonished, the children to be baptized, and perhaps the burial service to be read over the remains of one who has gone to rest. The delicate man of the world would consider the life of the missionary priest in the cities little less revolting. Sick calls are more frequent; the hospitals and poor houses are to be visited, and his door is hourly besieged by the poor and the stranger, who look upon the priest as their natural friend and adviser, and perhaps the only one whom God has left them. These must be relieved, and if too poor himself to extend the necessary aid, he is compelled to exert his *financial* abilities to procure, by rapacious onslaughts upon the pockets of his more fortunate parishioners, that which may be requisite to keep destitution from the garrets and hovels of God's poor. Yes, you are right; the Catholic system is a "system of finance," and the treasures accumulated by its operations are laid up "where rust does not consume nor thieves break in and steal."

You may form, from the above, some idea of the missionary life of a Roman Catholic priest in the United States; and to enable you to understand that the only motives capable of influencing men to undergo so much labor and privation must be supernatural motives, it is only necessary to add, that the usual income of a Catholic missionary, in this country, does not equal in amount the salary of a sexton in one of your fashionable churches. The excess of his income, too, over and above what is necessary for his simple wants, is almost

invariably expended in charity, so that at his death his effects are seldom more than enough to cover the expenses attendant on his funeral. And these are the men you call rapacious and fraudulent! They will forgive you, but it should be difficult for you to forgive yourself for having published so iniquitous a slander.

The Catholic Church is also "a trading corporation." I recollect to have read in the papers, some years ago, of some missionaries, in Oregon, the Sandwich Islands, and elsewhere, who had made very pretty business operations in trading with the natives; but these trading missionaries were not sent out by the Pope, and having families to support, and sons and daughters to educate and set up in life, I cannot find it in my heart to blame them for looking to the main chance.

These good missionaries, doubtless, found that furs, and peltry, and barreled fish were to be had, and money to be made out of them. Native labor, too, was cheap, and though possibly they would have preferred to exchange, for both commodities and labor, Bibles and tracts, which cost them nothing, and of which the natives, being unable to read, could make no use, these sons of the wilderness preferred the low wages offered for catching fish and trapping beavers. It was not for men situated as these missionaries were, to weigh too nicely the delicate question of moral ethics, presented for their consideration, and being unable to live by their ministerial calling, they added to it that of traders in furs and salmon. They were fishers, but not "fishers of men."

I do not mention these circumstances for the purpose of calling in question the good intentions by which the generality of Protestant missionaries are influenced, but merely to indicate, that before you charge the Catholic Church with being "a trading corporation," you should first look at home to see if your own skirts are clear.

And Catholicity is also a "system of darkened superstition!" The unbeliever will say the same thing of the system of Christianity. But I deny that you are capable of judging of the Catholic Church in this respect. You look at her through a false medium, which distorts and mystifies your vision, and makes those things appear superstitious, which, when clearly seen and rightly understood, are in reality beautifully harmonious and perfectly consonant with enlightened reason. No Protestant, whose ideas of the teachings and practices of the Church are gathered from the writings of her enemies, can possibly have a clear perception

of their real meaning. I hold, therefore, that if you are really sincere in your opinions, as you state them, you are, to all intents and purposes, insane on those subjects connected with the Catholic Church.

“Money is power!” In worldly affairs, *yes*; in spiritual affairs, *no*. Have you ever examined the yearly reports of the different Protestant foreign missionary societies, whose enormous incomes, if money was really power in religious affairs, ought to enable them to convert the whole pagan world in a few years? It were well for you to make this examination, and to compile, for the benefit of your readers, a table, showing the cost, *per caput*, of each convert to Protestantism. It is a well established fact, that the College De Propaganda Fide, in Rome, the yearly income of which is just \$85,000, annually converts more souls to Christianity than the whole machinery of Protestant missionary effort is able to evangelize. Almost every known language is taught in this institution by the first masters of the age, and it sends out yearly its bands of missionaries, like those sent out by our blessed Lord, without scrip or purse, to preach the gospel, in every land where man has a habitation. Money is not power! But the Word of God, preached by the authorized ministers of Christ, is power—not because of any intrinsic excellence of the teachers themselves, but from the Divine aid given to those sent of God, which enables them to produce fruits, where the efforts of mere human wisdom, sustained by millions of money, can find naught but unfertile fields and barren wastes.

“Knowledge is power?” Yes, but the tree of knowledge has two stems, one for good and the other for evil. Knowledge with religion is powerful for good; knowledge without religion is as powerful for evil. “Popery monopolized for ages the learning of the world, and seeks to do so still,” but “its hostility to common schools and general intelligence has grown into a proverb.” Here is a flat contradiction; but I suppose you mean to assert, that the Catholic Church reserves for its clergy all the learning, and is opposed to the spread of intelligence among the people. This is an old slander, the falsity of which you have had abundant opportunities to learn. According to their numbers, the Catholic people of Kentucky expend more money for educational purposes than does any Protestant sect in the State. They own and control a greater number of schools, academies and colleges for the education of the youth of both sexes than

any denomination of twice their number. But the Catholic Church is opposed to the education of the intellect to the exclusion of the education of the moral faculties. She wishes to have nothing to do with education where these are left to run wildly to ruin. There are many Protestants, of known virtue and intelligence, who fully agree with Catholics upon this point. No Christian, who will reflect on the tendency of this sort of education, as exhibited in the fruits of the German rationalistic school of the present day, can fail to recognize the wisdom of the Catholic Church in preferring that her schools be not only schools of intellectual knowledge, but also of virtue and religion.

If you mean by saying "there is scarcely a principle or tenet of Catholicism that does not bear a direct relation to the enslavement and degradation of mankind," that the Catholic Church labors to bring all men under the yoke of the gospel of Christ, you are perfectly correct in your estimate of her purposes. But there is no "degradation" in this. If you mean that through her principles and tenets she labors to degrade manhood from its true dignity, you entirely mistake the object of her mission. She seeks to raise up, but never to degrade. Your synopsis of the principles and tenets of the Church is, without doubt, the most unique affair of the kind that has ever come under my notice, and your explanation of the nature of her sacraments, affects me only with wonder at the insufferable stupidity of that mind, whose ideas are so much opposed to the plainest dictates of common sense. You say, in effect, that the ministry of the Church is the vital force of the Catholic system. Will you be kind enough to tell me what other force, than the teaching of the ministry, is indicated by the writers of the New Testament for the spread of the Gospel! You say that the Sacrifice of the Mass does away with the "great doctrine of justification by faith alone." In saying this, are you not treading on the toes of some of your non-evangelical Protestant neighbors?

You say "the Kentucky Catholic believes that Jesus Christ constituted the Romish King his special Vicar on earth, and therefore gave his perfectly conclusive testimony and sanction in favor of a royal form of government." The Kentucky Catholic says no such thing. He says that by appointment, as provided for by Jesus Christ in the economy of his Church, the Pope, as Bishop of Rome, possesses and exercises the office of Vicar of Christ upon earth. He comes by his royal prerogatives as other rulers come by theirs,

according to the genius and constitution of the State over which he is placed. His office of Governor of Rome is not necessarily connected with his office of Vicar of Jesus Christ.

The most astonishing portion of your whole article, however, is that in which Pius IX is charged with having ordered the execution of Ugo Bassi. This matter has often been put in so clear a light, that there is no excuse for your being ignorant of the facts connected with it. Mr. Cass, our Charge at Rome, whose letters were published in the American papers two years ago, says that the Austrian Military Governor of Bologna was alone responsible for that act, and that neither Pius IX, nor his Nuncio, Archbishop Bedini, had anything to do with it. Now I ask you, provided Know-Nothingism has not deprived you of all candor, to correct at least this one of your many aspersions of the Pope.

You conclude by saying, "though it is meet that Pius IX should be the head of such a system as Roman Catholicism, it is not meet that there should be such an unnatural personage as 'A Kentucky Catholic.'" You are at perfect liberty to think of me and my opinions as you please, and I shall not quarrel with you for expressing your thoughts. You and I are to be judged by tribunals composed of essentially different materials. Some of those for whom you write will very likely think with you that I am an unnatural personage, and you may possibly put your heads together to devise ways and means for exterminating all such. Those for whom I write, and who disclaim to be governed by the spirit of fanaticism, will be content to allow me and my fellow-religionists to believe as we please and worship as we please. They will look at our acts in order to discern if there be dangerous sentiments in our hearts. Will your party succeed in ostracising American citizens on account of their faith?—or will the true American party succeed in upholding the constitution and in rebuking fanaticism? I will tell you. *Desiderium peccatorum perihit*, which, freely translated, means, *Americans* "all still rule America.

Yours, &c.,

A. KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, December 14th, 1855.

LETTER ELEVENTH.

SIR:—It is a remarkable circumstance connected with this controversy, that you almost invariably state my propositions unfairly. For instance: you speak as if I had asserted, that the judgment which Almighty God has given to each one of us, is not to be used in spiritual matters; whereas, I argued only against the reasonableness of the Protestant principle of private interpretation of the scriptures. You speak of private judgment in the sense that it is a right. Catholics have no objection that all men shall hold the right to judge for themselves. But we also claim this same right, even though our judgment should lead us to the relinquishment of this “precious” privilege into the hands of the Church of God, so far as the interpretation of the scriptures is concerned. If I, through my judgment, am convinced, that Jesus Christ instituted a tribunal for the certain interpretation of His revelation, I am making a very poor use of my judgment in refusing to acknowledge the interpretations of such tribunal. In searching for truth, we are bound to use our judgment, aided by the Holy Spirit, invoked in prayer; and the Catholic Church not only does not oppose such use of our reason, but positively enjoins it. If men will but use the reason which God has given them, they must come to the conclusion, that if there be no other tribunal for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures than that of private judgment, then Christ has left his work in such a state as to render it practically impossible for them to arrive, with certainty, at “the knowledge of the truth.” There is scarcely a dogma held by any one of the Protestant denominations, that is not denied by some one or another of its sister churches. Reason must inevitably lead the logical mind to the appreciation of a principle conservative of truth—which is one; but the principle, that each individual Bible reader, must pick his faith out of the book, according to his own judgment of the meaning of its passages, is a principle that inevitably leads to diversity—which is error.

If the Apostle Peter, in his Epistles, “addressed himself to private interpretation,” as you say, why does he caution the people against so interpreting the Epistles of St. Paul, his co-laborers. He says that many of the writings of St. Paul “are hard to be understood,” and that “the unlearned

and the unstable wrest them, *as also the other scriptures*, to their own destruction."

You say that I acknowledge in one sentence what I contradict in another, and you instance this by my acknowledging that the Church has no right *to force* conscience, but that she has the right to command moral obedience. Almighty God has the right to require obedience to His laws, and yet He chooses to leave us free to disobey them. The Church is the organ of Christ, and has the right to command my obedience to her laws; yet, as there is no merit in worship that is not voluntarily accorded, so the enforcement of the outward manifestation of worship is not only useless, but is also opposed to the manifest will of God, that his creatures shall exercise the attribute of free-will. Your argument is based entirely upon the idea, that there is no such thing as free-will in man. It is unnecessary to say, that Catholics hold to no such doctrine.

I shall now take up your deductions from what you claim to be the admissions of "A Kentucky Catholic," and append to them, in the order indicated by yourself, such rejoinders as their context may require.

1st. "That the Divine law, or the law of conscience, is above all human law, and no legislation is binding which contravenes the Divine law or the law of conscience."

This is correctly stated. Do you deny the truth of the proposition? Would you obey any legal enactment which commanded you to do that which you believed to be opposed to the Law of God?

2d. "That this Divine law or law of conscience is binding to any extremity—even against personal violence or death itself, and must be enforced—no matter what the consequences."

I am really pained to have to charge you, in this, with having given your readers what appears to me a willful perversion of the obvious meaning of the text. In order to illustrate the proposition, I gave instances, supposed ones, of course, which could not fail to convey to any ordinary mind its exact meaning. It is very difficult for me to believe, that you misapprehended the idea I endeavored to convey, for the words "and must be enforced," embodied in your deduction, and which cannot be, even by the largest license, deduced from anything I have ever written, give another and an entirely different sense to the proposition. You endeavor to make your readers believe, that I hold, that Catholics, in order to uphold the law of their conscience, are bound to

make war upon the State, should it ever pass a law contrary to their understanding of the Law of God; whereas, I only said, that if the law of the State commanded Catholics to do that which they believed to be opposed to the law of God, it would be their duty to refuse obedience to such a law, even though death were the penalty of their refusal. Allow me to give you another illustration, in order that you may have a clear notion of my meaning. We will suppose that the mobocrats who surrounded the burning buildings of Quinn's Row, on the night of the 6th of August last, had been empowered, by previous legislative enactment, to grant an amnesty to such of the beleagured inmates as should consent to trample on the law of their conscience, and apostatize from their faith; and further, that according to the same enactment, they were commanded to shoot, hang, and burn, indiscriminately, all who refused the boon of life except at the expense of treason to their God. In such a case, I contend, that the law of conscience, which is the individual conception of what the law of God requires, should have induced these persecuted foreigners to accept the penalty attached to their contumacy, and to have thus upheld the "higher law" of their conscience.

3d. "That the Pope of Rome is divinely inspired to make known the Divine law, or the law of conscience, and therefore the law of God can always be *infallibly* known."

I said that the Pope, as Vicar of Jesus Christ, has authority to decide for Catholics all questions in the spiritual order, and that should the State enact a law of questionable obligation on conscience, his decision would be, for them, definitive as to the character of the law.

4th. "That the law of conscience may be interfered with by human legislation, and a conflict may at any time occur between spiritual and temporal jurisdiction."

This is so palpably true, that I suppose you will not deny it. The civil law, under the Roman Emperors, demanded that Christians should offer sacrifices to the gods of heathenism. Will you say that these Christians were wrong in refusing obedience to the law?

5th. "That in case of such conflict, the Pope of Rome is the supreme arbiter of the question, and his decision is final and conclusive."

6th. "That among the questions he has been called on to decide, is the validity of the constitution of the United States."

I only gave, for your consideration, a quotation from Dr. Brownson, wherein he states that "the Pope has already

decided 'that the Constitution of the United States requires nothing of the Catholic which is opposed to the law of conscience.' " I do not suppose that Dr. Brownson intended to assert, by this, that the question of the compatibility of the constitution with the Law of God, had actually been brought before the Pope for his decision, but only that, inasmuch as no Catholic has ever refused to obey the requirements of the constitution, the sequence was clear that it does not ask anything of him contrary to the Divine Law.

7th. "That no Catholic can plead conscience for violating a law, so it be *passed in accordance with the Constitution.*"

Laws in reference to temporal matters are of binding force until they are repealed, or pronounced unconstitutional by the proper tribunals. But no law, of any State, whether constitutional or otherwise, which commands either the Catholic or Protestant to do that which is in itself opposed to the Law of God, or the law of his conscience, is of binding force on the mind, and the Christian who should uphold the provisions of such a law, would, by the fact, cease to be a Christian.

8th. "That, though the Sovereign Pontiff has pronounced a decision favorably to the constitution, he may yet have to decide upon the validity of the statutes; and in case he decides that the statutes are unconscientious or unconstitutional, the loyalty of every Catholic is that moment released.

9th. "That the acts of our Congress, or the statutes of the States, are not conclusively settled by the supreme courts of the country, and have no binding effect unless sanctioned by his Holiness — of dernier resort.

10th. "That if the supreme courts of the Federal or State Governments should decide a statute one way, and his Holiness the other way, the latter must prevail, because his Holiness is *infallible*, and the spiritual order is superior to the temporal order.

11th. "The higher law doctrine is distinctly avowed and explicitly taught in its very worst form. The Foreign Judiciary at Rome is made superior to the Domestic Judiciary of the United States."

Sir, you either grievously misapprehend or willfully misstate the whole question. Your premises are false, and your conclusions are necessarily no conclusions at all. You assume what you should prove. In merely temporal or civil matters, the State is supreme; and neither the Catholic Church, nor its chief executive, the Pope, has any control whatever over its enactments or statutes, so long as they remain strictly within the civil order. It is only when the State departs from its own appropriate sphere of action, and wantonly tramples on the rights secured to every Christian alike by the Law of God, in the spiritual order, that the Church has an inalienable right to step forth and vindicate her outraged independence. Her motto, then, becomes that of the persecuted Apostles,

who, when arraigned before the Jewish tribunals and commanded to cease preaching Christ and His doctrines, answered, with a noble courage, "IT IS BETTER TO OBEY GOD THAN MAN."

Your entire reasoning is based upon that fallacy which logicians designate *ignoratio ebenchi*—a misconception of the question. If Dr. Brownson means to say, or even to intimate, that the binding force of the constitution depends upon the Papal sanction—which I cannot, as I have already said, believe to have been his meaning—then I differ from him *in toto* on the whole question. There is no evidence to show that the Pope has taken any action whatever on the subject. The civil authorities are supreme in the temporal order; their enactments are of binding force as long as they do not encroach on the rights of conscience, or, what is the same thing, trample on the Law of God, with which they have, obviously, no right to interfere. You would do well, sir, before you proceed further in this controversy, in which you have plainly already got far beyond your depth, to take some lessons in the elementary principles of a science commonly called *logic*.

The Pope has nothing to do with civil constitutions, congressional acts, legal enactments, or courts of civil judicature, outside of his own dominions, and his decisions on questions of conscience are not given with the purpose of influencing these. They are rendered only in order to indicate to the children of the Church what is demanded of them by the Law of God. All Christianity—Protestant no less than Catholic—teaches that human institutions are fallible. It follows, therefore, that laws for the government of human affairs may be of such a nature as to be opposed to the law of conscience, or to that individual understanding of the Divine Law, according to which every man must regulate his actions. From the very nature of the Being from whom it emanates, the Law of God cannot be otherwise than a perfect law, and every legal enactment opposed to it, or even to the individual perception of the obligations flowing from it, is necessarily unjust and iniquitous, and, as such, positively requires, at the hands of the conscientious man, that, sooner than obey its requirements, he shall consent to suffer whatever penalty it may enjoin for contumacy, even though that penalty be death itself. The Christian, in refusing to obey such a law, does not, as you would seem to indicate when you use the words "and must be enforced," attempt to control the action of the State, and endeavor to enforce the law of his

conscience against those who may as conscientiously differ from him. He acts solely for himself, considering that he owes obedience first and above all to the laws of his God. If this be the "higher-law" doctrine which you speak of, then it is the exact doctrine taught by every Christian denomination in the land; and a doctrine which every Christian, who is able to reason logically on the nature of his obligations in the moral order, is bound to uphold.

The Northern Abolitionists may be conscientious in holding that slavery is sinful; but they, not content with using moral means for the eradication of the supposed evil, are endeavoring to enforce the law of their conscience over those who as conscientiously believe that the institution is not opposed to the Divine Law. It is not required by our laws that these men shall be slaveholders, or even that they shall make use of the products of slave labor. In their mode of upholding the law of their conscience, they trespass as well on the consciences of others as upon their civil rights. If they believe that the institution of slavery is opposed to the Law of God, I blame them not for refusing to have anything to do with it. But I do blame them for seeking to measure the consciences of their neighbors according to their own standard, and for endeavoring to eradicate slavery by trampling on the rights of the South.

The question resolves itself into a nut-shell, and may be thus stated: Will not the Christian be held responsible before God for rendering obedience to an enactment which he conscientiously believes to be opposed to the Divine Law? If he will not be so held, then, the martyrs of all ages, who have shed their blood rather than compromise the law of conscience, were in fact no martyrs at all, and absolutely, by the very act of refusing to obey laws which they deemed repugnant to the Law of God, offered an insult to the Deity, who, according to your reasoning, wills that all civil laws, no matter whether in accordance with or opposed to the Divine Law, shall be implicitly obeyed.

This discussion, so far as the writer is concerned, closes with this letter. I have endeavored, in the course of it, to point out to you the injustice of the policy pursued by your party towards the Catholic Church and the Catholic people of this country. Though a more able controversialist, doubtless, might have presented the subjects I have discussed in a clearer light, and with more cogent reasoning; and though I may have failed to effect any change in your views, I can yet

entertain the hope that the letters of "A Kentucky Catholic" have not been altogether unproductive of good. I trust that they have been instrumental in removing doubts from some minds, and in convincing others, that the Roman Catholics of the United States have interests identical with their Protestant fellow-citizens in the perpetuity of our republican institutions.

Hoping the day will soon come when you, sir, will look with regret, if not with repentance, on the part which you have thought proper to take in disseminating the seeds of a reckless fanaticism broadcast over the land and trusting in Providence to render these seeds unproductive of the bitter fruits inseparable from their nature, where they are allowed to take root, I bid you farewell.

Yours, &c.,

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

Louisville, December 21st, 1855.

APPENDIX.

THE following editorial notice appeared in the columns of the *Louisville Journal*, in its issue of January 1st, 1856 :

We see from a notice in the St. Louis Republican that the letters, addressed to us in one of the Louisville papers under the name of "A Kentucky Catholic," have been published in book form. No doubt we might have learned the fact here if we had inquired. We remember that Mr. McGill, the former priest here, after having a written controversy with a distinguished Protestant clergyman, was silly enough to issue in book form the whole controversy. The Kentucky Catholic is smarter than that—he is very careful not to issue the articles of the Louisville Journal side by side with his own. He will not let our alkalies go with his acids. There are a hundred matters in the publications we have made that he would no more dare to put into the hands of his people than he would dare to grant them permission to read the Word of God. In fact, if his Church had one of their inquisitions here, and he were to republish our expositions of Popery even for the vain purpose of refuting them, he would soon find himself upon a wheel revolving faster than ever the wheel of fortune did.

Now, Mr. PRENTICE is certainly a very talented gentleman, and more witty even than he is talented; but when he takes so much credit to himself as to suppose that the Roman Catholic Church would be at all liable to damage, or that the faith of her members would be exposed to even the smallest danger, from the free circulation among them of his responses to the Letters of a Kentucky Catholic, he deceives himself most egregiously. It is precisely such men as he that have been butting their brains out against the rock upon which the Church is built, for more than three hundred years past. The editor of the *Journal* deserves credit for the energy he has displayed in a bad cause, and for having in imitation of the conduct of the unjust steward, spoken of in the scriptures, made "friends of the mammon of iniquity;" but he deserves the reprobation of every American citizen for having chosen

a bad cause wherein to exhibit his great talents and his untiring energy. "A Kentucky Catholic" cannot pretend to cope with Mr. PRENTICE either in wit, in learning, or in felicity of expression ; but he can cope with all the Know-Nothing editors in Christendom, in a love for truth, and in a hatred of fanaticism, bigotry, and lying.

If it were true that Catholics are afraid of the publication of discussions wherein both sides are fairly rendered, how does Mr. PRENTICE account for the fact, that the oral and written discussions of Messrs. Hughes and Breckenridge, Pope and McGuire, Campbell and Purcell, &c., are seldom to be found in any other than Catholic bookstores, and that most of them are published by Catholic booksellers? Now as to the proportionate circulation of such books,—for every copy of any published discussion, between a Catholic and a Protestant, which Mr. PRENTICE will find, throughout the State of Kentucky, in the possession of a Protestant, I will agree to show him three copies of the same work owned by Roman Catholics. Does this look like being afraid of the influence likely to be created by such works? There is no charge uttered against the members of the Catholic Church more utterly false, than that which exhibits them as living in constant trepidation lest *evangelical light*—God save the mark!—should dawn upon them. Catholics, as a class, are generally well read in those things which make up the distinctive differences between Protestantism and Catholicity—much more so than are most Protestants ; and the assumption that they are stupidly ignorant, is only the result of the false ideas propagated through early education, and that inherent spirit of indifferentism, which disinclines so many of our separated brethren to any examination of the points of difference between the two religions.

Mr. MCGILL, "the former priest here," did issue, in pamphlet form, the controversy which took place between himself and the Rev. Mr. CRAIK, of this city ; and there is one circumstance connected with that publication, which, if it proves anything, will prove the very reverse of the conclusion sought

to be drawn from it by the editor. I happen to know, that five-sixths of all the copies that ever were sold of the discussion named, were sold to Catholics by Catholic booksellers !

Again, Mr. PRENTICE characterizes the conduct of Mr. MCGILL, in having issued the book, as "silly," and implies that, according to Catholic usage, he was liable to severe punishment for having shown perfect fairness towards his opponent. How, then, does Mr. PRENTICE account for the fact, that instead of being made to revolve on the inquisitorial wheel, which he speaks of, Mr. MCGILL was actually, within a short time after the publication of the discussion referred to, raised by the Pope to the dignity of a Bishop in the Church ? How can the editor establish his theory, in the face of these facts ?

Mr. PRENTICE says : "There are a hundred matters in the publications we have made that he (A Kentucky Catholic) would no more dare to put in the hands of his people than he would dare to grant them permission to read the Word of God." In this there are no less than four false assumptions. First, the editor assumes that his articles are invincible, and that nothing has heretofore appeared so well calculated to overwhelm the Catholic Church ; whereas, in point of fact, he has said nothing new, and nothing that has not heretofore been better said. Besides, take them altogether, his articles are about the weakest affairs that have ever emanated from his brain ; so much so, indeed, that if his reputation as a writer depended on them alone, he would stand very little chance of being remembered half a dozen years after his death. Secondly, he assumes, that Catholics would be liable to ecclesiastical censure for reading or circulating his articles, even if accompanied with an exposure of their falsity or absurdity ; whereas, it is a well known fact, that Catholic publishers are in the habit of issuing unchecked books of religious controversy between Catholics and Protestants. Thirdly, he assumes, that A Kentucky Catholic is in a position where he may dictate to his brethren as to what they shall read and what they shall not read ; whereas, the writer

of the letters to Mr. PRENTICE has, in reality, no more power over their action in the premises than has the editor himself. Fourthly, he assumes, that Catholics are not privileged to read the Bible at all ; whereas, the reading of the Holy Scriptures is not only permitted to them by the Church, but is also strongly urged upon them.

The letters of "A Kentucky Catholic" are mostly made up of strictures on certain expressed opinions of the editor of the *Louisville Journal*, and of refutations of certain specific charges made by him against the Catholic Church and its members. Unless Mr. PRENTICE has been quoted unfairly by the writer — and the editor has brought no such accusation against him — there is evidently no necessity for the correct understanding and appreciation of the letters, that his responses should accompany them in the same book.

A KENTUCKY CATHOLIC.

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

~~A DUE DEC - 6 47~~

~~APR 13 54 H~~

~~MAY 20 1964 H~~

~~258 - 838~~

US 5321.150

The Catholic question in politics :

Widener Library

004353412



3 2044 086 277 613